

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. X.

July, 1913

No. 3.

LUTHER RICE AND HIS PLACE IN AMERICAN BAPTIST HISTORY.

BY PROFESSOR E. B. POLLARD, D.D.,

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PART I.

American Baptists have had a multitude of sturdy pioneers, and no scant number of resourceful and constructive leaders. Epoch-makers are always few. In the northern section of the country, there have been men of incalculable, molding influence, such as Morgan Edwards, James Manning, and Francis Wayland in education; and in the South such commanding figures as Furman, Boyce and Broadus. Thinking of American Baptist life as a whole, however, there have been but three epoch-making names—all of them gifts from New England Congregationalism—Roger Williams, Adoniram Judson and Luther Rice. Roger Williams gave the Baptists a start on this continent and planted the principle of religious liberty deep in American life. Judson and Rice, contemporaries and fellow-laborers for the truth, were the leading instruments, under God, in saving the Baptists of America from fatal self-contentment and the blight of Hard-shellism. Williams brought Baptist life and freedom; Judson and Rice interpreted these in terms of world-wide service.

It is not to be inferred, as some have done, that there was no interest in Missions, among Baptists, prior to the sudden appearance of these two bright luminaries in the Baptist sky. The facts are quite otherwise. And yet it was necessary for God to throw into our laps two very extraordinary men before it was made certain that our people would become a united, strong and aggressive force, in the missionary undertaking. In the seventeenth century, Baptists for the first time formed *local churches* on American soil; in the eighteenth, these churches organized *associations* for mutual religious profit; in the nineteenth, they brought into being *missionary societies* for the evangelization of the world.

The story of the unusual events which led to the coming of Judson and of Rice into the Baptist life has been so often recounted, that another narrative of that interesting chapter could, at first view, seem scarcely demanded. The period of the centennial of the first American Missions to foreign lands has already called out fresh retelling of the meaningful story. The present article is mainly concerned with the part Luther Rice played in those formative days when inspiration ran high and missionary organizations sprang up marvellously under his hand. For thirteen years, beginning with his return to the United States in the year 1813, Rice was the master spirit. At the critical period which confronted the Baptists during the first quarter of the nineteenth century, credit is due to him, more than to any other, for the part the denomination has since played in world-wide evangelization. It is from the conviction that American Baptists have never done full justice to this remarkable man, that this article is written. We believe the facts justify the statement that had it not been for mistakes and misfortunes which brought into eclipse the last decade of his life, Luther Rice would be freely accorded the highest place in the service of American Baptists during the nineteenth century. Yet, notwithstanding those unfortunate mistakes and misunderstandings (which shall be

recounted presently) Rice stands a colossal figure. Said recently a veteran Congregational minister, of Salem, Mass., (where Rice was ordained a minister and a missionary): "The Baptist denomination will have much to answer for in the judgment among their sins of omission, in neglecting to do justice to that great and good man." This is our view-point with regard to Luther Rice.

In the village of Northborough, Massachusetts, Luther Rice was born March 25, 1783. Both parents seem to have been persons of native force. Captain Amos Rice, the father, had been an officer in the Revolutionary army, a man of strong mind, but of not altogether exemplary habits. The mother is described as a woman of more than ordinary clarity and vigor of intellect, "which, with the advantage of the common schools and her subsequent application, she had to a considerable extent improved." Both parents were members of the Congregational Church, but the atmosphere of the Rice home did not suggest depth of religious devoutness, nor was it particularly favorable to the development of a high type of piety in the children. It is recorded that a devoted and pious aunt greatly assisted in Luther's religious training, and God had made the lad a twig rather easily bent toward spiritual things, for his disposition was tractable, amiable and reverent. As a scholar in the public schools, he showed diligence and aptness in the art of learning.

In order to appreciate the forces which shaped Rice's early life, it is necessary to understand what was going on in the life of New England at the close of the eighteenth century. Several waves of religious revival had swept over that section, and indeed, had extended more or less, along the entire reach of the eastern coast of our country—beginning with the Great Awakening, under the preaching of Edwards, Whitefield, Tennants, and others of less distinction. In the year 1793, one of these waves swept over New England. Communities were greatly stirred, and even the colleges, which had been affecting French infidelity, began to feel the new religious impulse.

Indeed, there was an awakening of the spiritual life in Europe as well, for in England and on the continent there was an outburst of freedom and fervor of soul, manifesting itself in the many movements toward a new humanitarianism, led by such men as Carey, the missionary, Howard, the prison reformer, Wilberforce, the philanthropist, and Robert Raikes, the father of the Sunday schools. The three most notable effects of the revival in New England Congregationalism were the throwing off of Unitarianism, the awakening of the missionary enterprise, and the fostering of ministerial education.

The type of personal religious experience of this period is also significant to our narrative. For, Jonathan Edwards, a generation before, had left the stamp of his massive personality and the character of his message deeply marked upon the churches of New England. Luther Rice, though brought up in a rather remote country village, was a child of the religious awakening of his day. The chief elements in the evangelistic message were three; a profound conviction of sin; the possibility of peace only through a complete surrender of the will to God; and a conscious and thorough-going change of life. Luther, as a child, early imbibed a very decided impression of personal sin, and of the divine holiness; of God's severe condemnation of sin; the difficulty of forgiveness, the fear of death and of eternal judgment. His childish feet moved under the frowning shadow of a broken law; the consciousness of which awakened in him at times feelings of poignant grief; at others, painful alarm. Says he: "The distress in my soul was so deep, constant and severe, that it impaired my health. My friends thought that my ill health affected my mind; but it was directly the reverse, my distress of mind injured my health. I rested not by day nor night." * * * "On another occasion, I had been praying to God to show me the worst of my case! Rising from my knees, and lying down upon my bed for sleep, it seemed for the moment that I was actually descending into hell! My horror and agony, it is not

possible in language to express! * * * but I did think, if ever I should indeed find deliverance and comfort, I would warn the wicked of their danger; and I did feel as if I could verily make the most hard-hearted sinner tremble."

It is not surprising that when surrender and peace were his, Luther Rice became a Christian of unusual zeal for the conversion of souls. Let him tell his own story of conversion. "One morning the thought came into my mind, agreeably to what the good ministers of a century back were wont occasionally to propose—whether I would be willing to put a blank sheet of paper with my name at the foot of it, into the hand of God, for him to fill up my destiny as might seem good in his sight. * * * I felt that I should be willing then to put a blank in the hand of God, to be by him filled as he might please. * * * I then found in this disposition of absolute unreserved submission to the will of God, a sweet and blessed tranquility. I had become reconciled to God!"

The struggle had lasted a year and a half or more—from his seventeenth to his nineteenth year. During this period he had made himself acquainted with some of the solid spiritual food of the century previous, like Baxter's "Call to the Unconverted," and his "Saints' Rest," Doddridge's "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul," John Newton's Works, and President Davies' Sermons—rather strong meat for a boy still in his 'teens. But Luther early took religion seriously, under the Puritan influences of the day. The significance of his conversion was not that he at length came to the point where he was "willing even to be damned for the glory of God," but that—in his own words—he was now "absolutely at the disposal of God." This struggle and victory were the key to his after life. One bright Sabbath Luther came down to the breakfast table, not burdened with his sins as formerly, but with light heart, and with this hymn of Isaac Watts ringing through the recesses of his entire being:

“Come, sound his praise abroad
And hymns of glory sing;
Jehovah is the sovereign God,
The Universal King.”

Now, do we not find in this hymn the joyous missionary note to which his after-life was attuned? So zealously did the young convert go to work to help those about him, many thought him unbalanced. He united with the Congregational Church in his home town on March 14, 1802. The family altar, which had been long broken down, was now rebuilt, under Luther's kindly insistence; though only a part of the family was willing to join in the regular devotions. The salvation of souls and the spiritual condition of the church bore heavily upon the young man's heart. He started social prayer-meetings in the village, but they were new in the community and few were interested enough to attend. His own father openly opposed his religious zeal, and but two persons encouraged him so much as to open their homes to these meetings of prayer. One was his older brother Asaph, who, though not himself sufficiently interested to join in the services, was sufficiently friendly to open his house, “regardless of the opposition of the minister, professors and the multitude.” The other sympathizer was a Baptist, not far away, who offered his house to be used at any time for the cottage meeting. Thus, through much tribulation and very scant encouragement, the young Christian did the first works of his new life—talking to the unconverted with whom he met, and enjoining a higher Christian living upon the indifferent professors of religion about him.

Up to this time, Luther Rice had had no other thought than that of remaining at home, working upon the farm and serving his Master faithfully in the little rural world about Northborough. The influences in the home and in the Church of which he was a member were toward a less active rather than toward a wider Christian service. A minister residing about ten miles away from North-

borough perceiving the young man's eager consecration and the zeal with which he met his obstacles and overcame them, suggested that perhaps God meant him for larger usefulness. He decided to enter Leicester Academy, and for three years studied assiduously to prepare himself for college. This he did so well that in October, 1807, he was able to enter Williams College in the sophomore class. Unlike Judson, Rice had fought out his personal, spiritual battle before entering college, and so was spared the influence of the reign of skepticism so prevalent at the time in the halls of learning. Rice carried to college a Christian zeal which had been born of personal struggle and complete victory.

The path by which Rice, the student, became Rice the missionary, is a simple one. Evangelistic enthusiasm marked his Christian life from its beginning. At Williams College, his meeting with several young men of kindred spirit, further widened his outlook and deepened his sense of responsibility. These were Samuel J. Mills, Jr., James Richards, Gordon Hall, Francis Robbins, Samuel Loomis and Byram Cree. The story of their meeting around a haystack at Williamstown—where a substantial stone monument now marks the spot as the "Birthplace of American Foreign Missions"—is too familiar to be recounted here. A society, known as "The Brethren" was formed, of which Rice was a charter member. Let it suffice to say that at this quaint place of prayer several earnest young men, praying for the speedy conversion of the world, dedicated themselves to the work of foreign missions, as soon as God should open the way for them to be sent to distant lands. In the year 1809, Rice and others of his Companions entered Andover Theological Seminary. Here they continued their thoughts upon foreign missions, their prayers and their self-dedication. Their number was supplemented by Adoniram Judson from Brown, Samuel Newell from Harvard, and Samuel Nott of Union. Which one of this little company was the first to suggest the idea to the rest, or which the earliest to

consecrate himself to the task of foreign missions, it is now difficult to say. God seems to have wrought almost simultaneously upon their hearts and brought them together by a common, holy impulse. They called their band a "Society of Inquiry on the Subject of Missions," and Rice became its president. They met secretly, for there was scant sympathy found outside their circle. No one could come into the society who was not personally pledged to give himself to the enterprise of foreign missions. As the time approached for some of these young men to leave the Seminary, they for the first time apprised their professors of the great thought which burdened their hearts. It so happened that the General Association of Congregational Ministers was about to convene at Bradford, Mass. It was decided to draw up a petition to that body signed by Judson, Nott, Newell, Rice and Richards, setting forth their desire, and asking advice and assistance in their great purpose. Dr. Spring, of the Andover faculty advised that the list of signers was too large—for the brethren in the Association might be alarmed at so sudden and formidable a show of missionary zeal. At his advice, the last two names, those of Rice and Richards, were stricken off. This petition from students of the "Society of Inquiry on the Subject of Missions," was the beginning of the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions," organized June 29, 1810, instituted for the purpose of putting the request of the petitioners into execution. But much was necessary before so great an undertaking was possible. It was not till June, 1812, that sufficient funds were available to send the young men who offered themselves upon the altar of oriental missions. Judson had been sent to England to confer with English brethren—who had already been laboring in the East for about two decades. Through this visit he almost compelled the Congregationalists of Massachusetts to act promptly; and Judson, Newell, Nott and Gordon Hall were designated the first missionaries of the American Board. Rice was griev-

ously disappointed that he was not among the appointees. There were two reasons for his being left out. The first was the lack of sufficient funds. For while a bequest of thirty thousand dollars had been made by a good woman from Salem, the actual cash in hand was only five hundred dollars, with twelve hundred in sight, and six thousand really necessary. But there was a second reason, the young woman whom Rice loved, and wished to take with him to his chosen field of service, after some hesitation, decided she would not go. But Rice had heard God's voice and was resolved not to turn back. He pleaded with the brethren to send him with the others. Dr. Worcester, one of the leaders, took his side; and the Board agreed to appoint him, at the last moment, *provided* he would secure the money to defray his own expenses! But Rice was dauntless, and undismayed by all the discouragements which were put in his way. Busily he went to work in the nine days remaining, and when the time came he had fitted himself out and had the necessary amount in hand and was happy. On February 6, 1812, in the old Tabernacle Meeting House, Salem, Mass., the five young men were set apart to the gospel ministry and as missionaries to the heathen. Thus did Salem become our American Antioch. Mr. and Mrs. Judson (Ann Haseltine) and Mr. Newell with his beautiful girl wife, Harriet (the first of American Missionaries to give up her life), set sail from Salem February 19; and the other little party composed of Mr. and Mrs. Nott, Hall and Rice, left Philadelphia on February 18, but were delayed by unfavorable winds at Newcastle, Delaware, till February 24. The sturdy little craft, *The Harmony*, upon which Rice and his party sailed, reached Calcutta, August 10, about six weeks behind the other party.

It is necessary to speak of the steps by which Luther Rice became a Baptist. In his youth, Rice must have known of the Baptists, for they increased quite rapidly in New England after the Great Awakening. For a while most of the New England Baptists already in existence

at that period gave scant sympathy to the revival; the revival greatly replenished the Baptist fold. Entire Congregational churches, "New Lights," impressed with the need of a regenerated church membership, came over to the Baptists. Other churches of the standing order divided; a part becoming Baptist. These so-called "Separate Baptist" churches gave new life and prominence to the Baptist movement, commenced a century earlier at Providence and Newport. Gradually, through the mediating influence of the Philadelphia Association, which had come into existence in 1707, the older and the newer type of Baptists grew into one. At the time of Rice's birth, the Regulars and the Separates had become united, and aggressive. It will be recalled that among the very few who had given to the ardent young Christian enthusiast a helping hand when he proposed his house-to-house prayer meetings was a Baptist brother in Luther Rice's neighborhood. There is no evidence that Rice gave any special attention to matters which divide Baptists from others till his student days at Williams College. Here he had repeated debates with a Baptist fellow-student on the subject of infant sprinkling. Rice held vigorously to his Pedit-baptist views, but in private correspondence acknowledged his surprise at the strength of the opponent's position.

A coincidence connected with the voyage of Rice to the Orient is of importance here. Dr. William Johns, an English Baptist missionary, had been for some months in this country soliciting assistance for the work, begun by Carey, in India. After a successful campaign he started eastward, but by an accident to the ship, he and his companions were forced to take a later sailing. This threw them upon the ship *Harmony*, upon which Rice set out, as before stated. On shipboard discussions upon the subject of baptism were frequently engaged in by the missionaries; Rice stoutly maintaining the side of the Pedit-baptists. It is not true, as some writers have implied, that Rice, as well as Judson, though sailing by dif-

ferent ships, came to hold Baptist views, on the way to their field of missionary labor. When Rice arrived at Calcutta, he was apparently as staunch in his early views as ever. Mr. Judson, writing of Rice's arrival, six weeks later than his own, says: "At that time I was deeply involved in the subject of baptism, which I had begun to investigate on shipboard, and I soon learned that some of the passengers from Philadelphia were in a similar position, and that Mr. Rice had rather distinguished himself by reading everything within his reach, and manifesting uncommon obstinacy in defending the old system. Soon after my baptism, he came to live with me in order to enjoy better accommodations than he found elsewhere. At first he was disposed to give me fierce battle, but I held off, and recommended him to betake himself to the Bible and prayer."

Rice seems to have taken Judson's suggestion and read as extensively upon the subject as the facilities at hand warranted. An English gentleman in Calcutta is said to have had quite a goodly array of books to which Rice was accorded access.

Mr. and Mrs. Judson were baptized September 6, 1812. On the 17th following, Judson preached from the text, "Go ye, therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc." Mt. 28:19. Rice was present and afterwards wrote the following in his diary: "His object was to show what is baptism, and to whom it is to be administered. I have some feeling of difficulty on this subject, which I find myself reluctant to disclose to my brethren. May the Lord himself lead me in his own right way." This is the first evidence of any weakening of his former position. About three weeks later, he records in his journal a conversation with his Congregational friends, Hall and Nott, in which he frankly discloses to them the uncertain condition of his mind, and states that special prayer was made for divine guidance. The reading of the New Testament and prayer on the subject of baptism were his daily experience for weeks. On October 12, he

writes to his brother Asaph: "Brother Judson has become a Baptist. . . . I am endeavoring to investigate thoroughly the subject of the sacred ordinance of baptism. What will be the result of these inquiries, I am not able at present to say, but from the progress already made, I conceive it to be possible that a revolution in my own mind similar to that which my dear brother and sister have experienced, may take place. . . . My affection for them can by no means determine me to become a Baptist, without the conviction that Baptists are in the right, nor can I on the other hand, be deterred from conscientiously examining the subject, nor my following what really appears to be the truth; notwithstanding any unpleasant consideration attending such a change of sentiment in my situation. And it is a principle with me, that truth can be no loser by the most rigorous examination, provided that examination be conducted in the fear of God, with a sincere desire to know the truth and a disposition to do his will."

In his journal of November 1, 1812, he thus writes: "Was this day baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity. The Lord grant that I may ever find his name to be a strong tower, to which I may continually resort and find safety." The following day he writes his parents: "Yesterday I was baptized by the Rev. Mr. Ward, and enjoyed the privilege of uniting with the Baptist Church in Calcutta, in celebrating the sacred ordinance of the Lord's supper. It was a comfortable day to my soul."

It was a courageous act on the part of Rice to face the situation of mind into which he had come, and to fight it through to a solution. It cost him, as it cost Judson, much suffering. It was no trivial experience to break away from life-long friends and habits of thought and practice, to say nothing of official relation to the American Board. There was no good reason for either Judson or Rice to suppose that their change of views on baptism would mean utter religious isolation, or want of financial support. It was reasonably certain that they would find

sympathy and opportunity for service among the Baptists of England or of America, or of both. But their act was that of men of undoubted sincerity and courageous faith.

There were two courses open to these new recruits to the Baptist ranks. They could not turn back from their plans to preach the gospel to the heathen—their hand had been put to the plow. They might seek employment with the English brethren, with whom fellowship had already been most cordial; or they might attempt to arouse American Baptists to systematic support of an Eastern mission. The former seemed the easier way; and this doubtless would not have been difficult for Judson, since he had already contemplated the possibility of going out under English auspices, in case the Congregationalists of America should fail to organize for foreign work. Some of the English Baptists seemed to favor the taking over of the Judsons and Rice, but William Carey with the broader outlook, counselled the other course. He saw the possibility of awakening a vigorous and growing body of American Baptists to organized effort for missions. Strangely enough, (in the light of subsequent experiences of Judson abroad and Rice in America), Carey also expressed doubt whether the Americans would be willing to share the hardships incident to the meager financial support and the inevitably harsh conditions which the Englishmen accepted willingly. Carey, while most brotherly in his bearing toward the new recruits, more than once expressed the view that American Christians ought to do more for the American Indians. Indeed, there was evidently no small number who thought that the old world should be left to British missionaries and the new to the Americans. Dr. Judson refers to this sentiment in a letter to Dr. Staughton (March 7, 1817) in these words: “The British are under no greater obligation to evangelize them (Eastern peoples) than the Americans . . . furthermore, throughout all those countries the British are suspected and feared; but not the

Americans. . . . When we apply the case to the Baptists the case is still more decisive. There are about five hundred Baptist churches in Great Britain, which average one hundred members each. There are two thousand in America, which average about the same."

Mr. Sharp, of Boston, writing to Mr. Marshman, co-laborer with Carey, concerning the formation of the Baptist convention for foreign missions (May, 1814) organized to support Judson and Rice, said: "It has occurred to the brethren here that it would much advance the cause, and that Messrs. Judson and Rice would be much more happy and useful in the service, if these were under the direction and intimately connected with our beloved brethren at Serampore." But circumstances were to shape themselves in a way which could not be at first foreseen.

The times were politically troublous. The English authorities at Calcutta had very scant sympathy for missionary enterprises. The East India company, of course, put commercial considerations ahead of the religious. They seemed to fear lest the presence of missionaries might interfere with their control over the natives. Besides, the war of 1812 between Great Britain and the United States, which was now on, did not make for any particular concessions toward American missionaries.

After days of uncertainty, Rice and Mr. and Mrs. Judson were forced to take ship bound for the Isle of France, where they arrived January 16, 1813.

It was here that Rice decided to return to America, after prayerful thought and by the acquiescence of Mr. and Mrs. Judson. Rice gave the following as among his reasons for so doing: First, to adjust in a regular and a proper manner, relations with the Board which had sent him out. Second, to try to engage American Baptists in missionary undertaking, and incidentally to stop at South America to investigate it as a missionary field; to have time *en route* to study the Malay language, and to

restore his health—which had been very poor since his voyage to the East.

The ship upon which Rice sailed from the Isle of France was bound for St. Salvador, South America. Here he remained two months, partly for the reason just indicated, and partly because the ship upon which he had set out was to continue its journey to Salem, Mass., with saltpeter, a contraband article, and it was not thought expedient that any passenger be aboard. Rice, however, found passage at length for New York, arriving in that city, September 7, 1813. He proceeded, after four days, to Boston to adjust matters with the American Board. He had written them from Calcutta of his change of sentiments on the subject of baptism, but now he sought to present formally to the Board his state of mind, and ask to be discharged from their service. He was granted the audience, September 15th, telling them in a straightforward, frank way, his experiences, culminating in a change of view. The Board met him coldly, and refused to give him a direct official statement of their position toward him. Rice found out by inquiry that the Board regarded the very fact of his conversion to Baptist views and his immersion in itself a severance of his connection with the society which had commissioned him. It is quite natural, no doubt, that the Board found it hard to treat Judson and Rice with Christian courtesy and fraternal regard. The turn things had taken was indeed a severe blow; for Judson and Rice were the very flower of their enterprise. Looking back, it seems strange that prominent men, former friends and co-religionists of these devoted young missionaries should have so misinterpreted their motives as to accuse them of double-dealing, self-seeking and falsehood. Ezra Stiles Ely, (editor *Quarterly Theol. Review*, vol. ii. p 94) observed: "Our respectable Baptist friends will not boast in the conversion of Mr. Judson nor glory even in his best missionary labors, until he shall confess and forsake the sin of lying!" In the same article Mr. Rice is accused of mercenary mo-

tives, and of "thriving" upon his change of affiliation.

To illustrate the way in which Congregationalists of to-day look upon these missionaries and the superior Christ-like spirit of the men of the present, we may quote from a recent address by the Rev. Dr. J. L. Hill, of Salem, Mass., in a centenary address at the unveiling of a tablet to the memory of the first American foreign missionaries. He said: "What names are these? The first (Judson) is the monarch of missionaries. As one star differeth from another star in glory, it is extremely suggestive to notice that whenever American missionaries are listed, his distinguished name leads all the rest. If ever a missionary has been practically canonized it is Judson. . . . whose praise is in all the churches." Of Rice, he says: "The last name (on the tablet) is Luther Rice, the orator of the group. Above the ordinary height, robust, perfectly erect, having the gift and temperament of the orator, and having besides his commanding presence, talents of the very first order—sprightliness, pathos and a natural and vigorous eloquence, always exceedingly felicitous and impressive, he was ranked as one of the most interesting and effective speakers of the land."

Discoursing further upon Rice's labors for missions and education, Dr. Hill adds: "When the hand of time has marred the extended epitaph inscribed on marble (of his tomb), his name, with its immortal renown, will be found recorded, high in the temple of fame for the admiration of all."

Having shown proper respect for the Society under whose auspices he had gone out, Rice sought the Baptists, visiting a number of influential men in and around Boston. In the latter part of September a meeting of prominent leaders was called. The Boston Baptist Foreign Missionary Society which had already been formed for the purpose of looking after Judson's support, was first thought to be properly the organization to undertake the eastern enterprise. Mr. Rice, however, advised

a larger outlook, and suggested that the Baptists of the entire country, so far as might seem practicable, be asked to unite in the new undertaking. This view prevailed and Rice went forth to rally the Baptist forces. He turned his face southward (after a brief visit to his aged parents in Northborough) and went to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, besides many of the smaller towns between these important centers. A cordial hearing was given him everywhere. It was, he tells us, on a stage-coach, between Richmond and Petersburg, that the plan of organization flashed into his mind. It was this: that local societies, organized wherever possible, become auxiliary to one larger organization, in each State, and that the State organizations thus formed, send delegates to form one, great general society, its executive officers to be located at some one central point.

The winter was spent principally in the South. Twenty missionary societies were organized, thirteen hundred dollars in money were collected by Mr. Rice, but the chief result was in the sentiment cultivated and the plans laid for the meeting to be called in the following spring, for the purpose of effecting a general organization. This took place in Philadelphia, May 18, 1814. Ministers and laymen from different sections of the country convened with much hope and enthusiasm. Dr. Richard Furman of South Carolina was made president, and Dr. Thomas Baldwin, of Boston, secretary, of the "General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States for Foreign Missions."

In this convention Luther Rice was a marked figure in a group of notable men. There were only thirty-three persons in the meeting, but it would be difficult, even to-day, to bring together a company of Baptists for missionary purposes, in which so large a proportion of them should be men of equal ability with those who made up this first general convention of Baptists for foreign missions. From New England were such leaders as Thomas

Baldwin, Lucius Bolles, and Stephen Gano; from the Middle States were William Rogers, William Staughton, Henry Holcombe, Horatio Gates Jones and Burgiss Allison; from the South came Richard Furman, Robert B. Semple and William B. Johnson. There were seven laymen in the convention, a leader among whom was Judge Tallmadge of New York. Rice was appointed upon two of the leading committees to further the plans of the organization.

Prof. J. D. Knowles, who was associated with Rice and the leaders almost from the beginning of the movement, wrote in the *Christian Review* of which he (Knowles) was editor (March, 1837): "To Luther Rice we must ascribe the chief honor of devising and carrying into successful execution the plan of the convention as it was actually organized."

When once the organization was effected and he became its first missionary appointee and general agent, with instructions to remain in this country till it seemed best to return to the East, Rice threw himself with the most strenuous zeal into the work; as indeed he had been chiefly instrumental through travel and by public and personal interviews, in calling the convention together in Philadelphia.

As has already been intimated, the Baptists of America were not, by any means, utter strangers to missions prior to 1814, as some seem to infer. The fact that they had grown from a mere handful at the middle of the seventeenth century to nearly two hundred thousand at the beginning of the nineteenth, was due to the zealous home missionary spirit of sturdy pioneers. Prior to 1814 there had been a goodly number of honorable efforts among Baptists to spread the gospel among the American Indians, and as for the Negroes, the Baptists "went after them and got them." Nor was foreign missions a totally neglected field. Many individual Baptists had been from almost the first, sending money to aid Carey's work in the East, even though he himself repeatedly urged that

their peculiar call was not so much to the East as to the Indians at home. Associations, like that of Philadelphia and of Charleston, had already expressed sympathy for world-wide missions. The former, in 1794, appointed one of its number to receive contributions for Carey's work, less than a year after that mission was opened. It was natural that the earliest of modern missionary movements, being by English Baptists, should have deeply impressed American Baptists. It may be doubted whether any other denomination of Christians in the United States at that time was so ready for missionary forward movement as the Baptists. In no sense is it taking away from Judson and Rice credit for the powerful influence they exerted at this juncture, to affirm this. Monthly and quarterly *concerts* of prayer for missions were being adopted by the churches in increasing numbers; local missionary societies had begun to spring up, though yet few in number, and several missionary periodicals, more or less local in character, had already made their appearance.

In estimating the place of Luther Rice in the religious life of his times and his contribution to Baptist history, it must be said that his record is not to be judged by the success or failure of particular institutions. Both the Triennial Convention, and Columbian College, had careers of vicissitude. The former was disrupted by slavery, the latter dwarfed by debt. It is what Rice achieved as a promoter of high public sentiment, which was translated into action, among Baptists that gives him eminent place. He came upon the scene at a time when the denomination stood at the parting of the ways. He, more than any other single force, turned the masses of Baptists from the road of reactionism to the highways of progress. Coming, as he did, from another body of Christians, he was wondrously quick to discern the possibilities of the Baptist people, even if he did not quite understand their ways. First, he, more than any other person of his day, taught the masses of American Baptists to think in terms *world-*

wide. Rice made the victory over hard-shellism certain by his marvellous campaigns of eloquence and education, from association to association; from church to church; from city to city; from house to house. Scarcely a hamlet failed to feel the pulses of his unquenchable enthusiasm. The very *penetralia* of Baptist life was touched and powerfully moved. The anti-mission spirit withered, and indifference gave way to enthusiastic giving and praying for the conversion of the world. The awakening of men, women and children was, in some localities, like a new crusade for the Kingdom of God.

Rice was also the first to lead the Baptists to think nationally. When Judson might have been absorbed into the English Mission, Rice resolved on returning to America to arouse the Baptists of the United States to their heaven-sent opportunity. When his native New England would have cheerfully taken over both Judson and Rice, and provided for their support, Rice insisted that the entire brotherhood be summoned to the task. It was he who went up and down the land calling Baptists North, South and West to the city where the thirteen colonies had first declared their union in a common undertaking—that the entire denomination might organize for a great adventure. Pity, indeed, that sectional agitation and civil strife should for years have partially undone the work of that hour. But God overrules in the affairs of men, and the denomination has never entirely lost the spirit of the brotherly covenant wrought out in Philadelphia in 1814, when Furman, of South Carolina, and Baldwin, of Massachusetts, sat as officers at the same table and directed the affairs of the first National Convention of American Baptists. It was Rice, who (like George Washington, when he advocated a great university at the seat of the national government as a force for national unity) worked for a central seat of learning at Washington, as a bond of national unity for Baptists.

(Part II Continued in next issue.)

MODERNISM.

BY PROFESSOR GIOVANNI LUZZI, FLORENCE, ITALY.

A short time ago a gentleman came to me with a letter of introduction from a friend of mine who entreated me to do my best to help his protege.

"Well, what can I do for you?" I asked.

"I have come to Florence to study Modernism; and I should be very much obliged if you would be so kind as to help me," he answered.

"And how long are you going to stay in Florence?"

"I must leave for home the day after to-morrow."

I was flabbergasted and advised my visitor to change his plans and to spend the short time he had at his disposal in.....sight-seeing.

Such is the idea a great many people have of Modernism. They think it is the simplest thing in the world, but I wonder if there has ever been a more complicated subject on earth.

The word "modernism" is quite familiar to us all. All talk of modernism; all discuss it; but modernism, what is it? That is the question.

A short, exact, comprehensive definition of modernism is impossible, for modernism is a complex phenomenon; and a conglomeration of several different phenomena such as this, cannot be defined by a single formula. Nor can the term "modernism" itself lead us to a precise conception of this great movement. The term was not bestowed on the movement by the modernists. Just as the name "Christian," whether of Latin or Greek origin, was undoubtedly invented by the pagan inhabitants of Antioch to censure and despise the disciples of Christ, so the name "modernism" was invented by the enemies of the new movement, to disgrace and condemn it. This is why the name does not help us in the least to understand what the movement is.

“Modernism” is a word coined by the Jesuit fathers of Rome. Leo. XIII and Pius X got hold of it, and gave it a kind of theological and ecclesiastical consecration. The official Roman Catholic press received it from the hands of two Popes, and it began at once to be used and is still used to distinguish and condemn everybody and everything that is not in perfect communion of thought and ideals with the Vatican. Higher criticism, Christian democracy, loyalty to united Italy with Rome as capital, aspirations to a reformation within the Church, longings for a purer and more spiritual form of Christianity, all that, and more, is “modernism,” for the Vatican. The Curia could not better define it than as “a huge cloak to hide a multitude of sins.” In fact, the Vatican has defined it as “A satanic cry of rebellion against religion from the bosom of the Church.” Such a definition is an exaggeration due to nothing else but fear. In reality “modernism” is a cry of rebellion not against religion, but against the tyranny of the Curia; it is an aspiration after a reform within the Church of Rome; it is a longing for a purer form of religion; for a return to the primitive simplicity of faith, for a wider, higher interpretation of Christianity, more compatible with modern conscience.

Let no one be deceived about the importance of the movement. The very fact that the Vatican is afraid of it, should be sufficient to prove that it is a serious, grave, and threatening fact. But much more than that may be said. In an article I wrote in January, 1911, for the Hibbert Journal, to show the importance of the movement, I said: “Modernism is not a system; it is the synthesis of several new directions taken by theological and ecclesiastical thought in the Roman Church;” and I traced it out five of these different directions: 1st: The direction followed by a group of noble souls who grieve to see popular piety attacked by the disease of an exaggerated and hysterical sentimentalism, and fossilised into a nerveless formalism; 2nd: The direction followed by a group of

still more daring modernists, by whom the question of the temporal power of the Pope has been disposed of entirely, and who say frankly: "In the Church of today, reform is necessary so as to lead the flock of Christ back to the spirit of the Gospel;" 3rd: The direction followed by the hypercritical modernists, whose spiritual mother was German rationalistic theology and whose intellectual father was Prof. Alfred Loisy; 4th: The direction followed by a group of modernists of the Christian democracy led by Romolo Murri, and, finally, 5th: The direction followed by the practical modernists who, determined to give the word of God back to the people, founded the "Pious Society of St. Jerome for the spread of the Holy Gospels."

Scarcely two years have elapsed since I wrote that article, and my division into five directions does not hold good any longer, for, whilst the first two still exist, I may safely say that there is no more question of the other three. The hypercritics have advanced so much, that they now consider Christianity as a form of religion already *passée*, and the Church as unworthy of their thought. Christian democracy, abandoned as it was by Romolo Murri, and left without a leader, has ceased to exist. The Pious Society of St. Jerome is dead and buried. So that one might feel inclined to believe that modernism also is dead; that it has been a dream, a beautiful dream, but nothing more than a dream. But, to think so, would simply be the grossest of errors. Modernism lives, it is stronger than ever, it has invaded the whole of the clergy, the whole of the Church, and has gained the sympathy of a large part of the better class of the laity, which only a few years ago smiled with compassion at the very mention of the term "modernism." Listen to what Leone Caetani, a member of the Italian Parliament and belonging to the great Roman family who gave Boniface VIII to the history of Papacy, says about it: "Modernism, the wood-worm, the deadly bacillus which will kill papal Catholicism, is the purest expres-

sion of the present religious conscience. Modernism is not a school, but a vague general tendency, an undefinable sentiment, without exact limits, without any settled goal, without discipline and without leaders. Whoever has only the shadow of a doubt about the most insignificant part of the religious edifice of Roman Catholicism, is already a modernist. These undefined characters constitute its greatest strength, inasmuch as they show the universality of its tendency and the impossibility of fighting it effectively. It is everywhere, but nowhere in particular; it is intangible, but is always more lively and evident than ever. The Church of Rome, in chasing modernism, is pursuing her own shadow; inseparable from her, and at the same time unseizable."

Leone Caetani is perfectly right in his statement; it only needs to be completed. He says that modernism is "a vague, general tendency, an undefinable sentiment, without exact limits, without any settled goal." And really modernism might have been so described up to the present time; now, however, the "general tendency" and the "undefinable sentiment" have at last taken distinctive shape in a precise and well-defined Programme.

First of all it states that the Church only has the right and duty to initiate religious reform; and that by the term 'Church' is understood not the ambitious and unscrupulous "ecclesiola" or sect gathered round the Pope, but the union of all believers in Christ who, through their works show the sincerity of their faith in Him. Then follows their statement about the reform they are aiming at: "We want the revision of dogma, the revision of all our confession of faith; we want to see that which in Christianity is substantial, separated from what has been added afterward in the interest of the sacerdotal caste. We want the authority of the Pope to be confined to reasonable limits, and the old authority of the episcopacy and laity, with their rights and freedom to be restored to them. We want for all believers the right of free research in all fields, recognised as legiti-

mate. We do not want the abolition of hierarchy, but we want all grades of the hierarchy, from the humblest to the highest, to be represented not by ambitious men, or by intrigues, but by men imbued with the apostolic spirit. We want to do away, once and for all, with the ridiculous fiction that the Pope is a prisoner of the Italian government, and we want to see the Pope himself go from diocese to diocese, in order to learn from observation about men and things, to get a personal knowledge of all ecclesiastical abuses, and to depose all unworthy priests and bishops. Among the rights to be given back to the clergy, we want celibacy to be voluntary, not compulsory. If it is true that marriage is a sacrament for the layman, we want it to be also for the priest; why should it be for the priest only a curse and a shame? As far as worship is concerned, we wish to have it brought back to its ancient simplicity and purity. We want the abolition of the Latin language in the Liturgy; the abolition of all those idols, which not only have no justification in any true and certain tradition, but very often are shown by sound criticism, to be historically non-existent. We want the veneration due to the great saints of the Church not to replace the worship due to God alone; and we do not want this worship to be material as it is now, but we want it to become again a worship 'in spirit and in truth.' We want to put a stop to the excessive right of guardianship which the priest has always exercised over the faithful; that kind of guardianship, which may, perhaps, have its use (although we seriously question even this) during spiritual infancy, but which becomes utterly disastrous and humiliating in the case of the spiritually grown-up. The adult must be able to do many things for himself; and, as far as his conscience is concerned, he must know that between his conscience and his God there is no room for human mediators. We want the abolition of all false devotional practices; and, as a substitute for all morbid, sentimental books of prayers and pious meditations, we desire the Gospel of Christ, the greatest book

which Christianity possesses, the only book able to educate the spirit to a true and manly piety."

Such is the revolutionary Programme of 1908. Let us now ask: How has this revolutionary movement been brought about?

Two things have caused it: The condition into which Roman Catholicism has fallen. In order to judge rightly of Roman Catholicism one must not study it as it appears in Protestant lands or in the works of its great writers such as Newman, Manning or others gone over to Romanism from Protestantism. Romanism, in Protestant lands, is quite different from what it is in Latin countries; it cannot help being subjected to Protestant influence; and therefore moderates itself there, for it knows that no Anglo-Saxon mind would ever adapt itself to accept as Christian many religious exhibitions which are accepted as such in the Abruzzi, in the Neapolitan provinces and in Sicily. And as far as those great English writers whom Roman Catholicism rightly boasts of are concerned, everybody knows that they accepted Romanism not as it is, but an idealisation of it. What they describe is not real Romanism; it is a kind of ideal Romanism.

Nor is it enough, in order to judge rightly of Roman Catholicism, to run through Italy from Piedmont to Sicily in a "train de luxe," only making a fleeting stay at the principal towns, entering the first church one comes across, and asking for some information from the first person one has met casually, or to whom one has been given a card of introduction. No, in order to judge rightly of Roman Catholicism, one must needs live in a Latin country, to study the inhabitants thoroughly, to examine all their religious practices, to search the very soul of the people, to win the confidence of the noblest part of the clergy, to enter into full communion of spirit and affection with those souls who suffer, who groan, and who long for redemption from a bondage that has become unbearable to them.

For, to such point as that, have we arrived.

The young are in a state of feverish unrest in their Seminaries; they feel that the teaching imparted them is no longer up to date; that the way in which they are prepared for practical life, is absurd. They issue energetic protests, in which they say: "What our School lacks is fearless trust in science and freedom. Such a fatal deficiency in our Schools and in our studies will last, as long as Seminaries are not converted into sacred places intended to sow, lovingly and disinterestedly, in the hearts of the young the first seeds of spirituality and of science, and as long as they remain what they are at present: namely, places where science is monopolized with a view of turning out useful and trustworthy ecclesiastical functionaries. In our Seminaries we are living in a world of extraordinary smallness, where strong virtues no longer grow, but only passive, resigned individualities, pale hot-house flowers, which fade away as soon as the first spring winds begin to blow." And the seminaries exhort each other to prepare themselves for the coming insurrection, crying: "Brethren, the salvation of the Church lies with us!"

Among the clergy, the pure, noble-minded men, who conscientiously keep their vows, are the exception; they are men who give themselves passionately to works of charity, to literature, and to science. The honest priests, the priests who in this respect also want to live in harmony with God and with their conscience, lift their voice full and loud, and appeal to the laity for their sympathy. Listen to what they say: "No, we do not want any longer a hidden and sinful love, the only one allowed to us by the cruel law of celibacy, a love full of intrigue and kept in the darkness, like contraband goods. We want the love that does not fear the full light of the sun; the love of one woman who will devote to us, without remorse, the whole treasure of her affection; the love which is a caress in the beautiful and calm moments of life, and a source of strength in the inevitable discouragements that assail

man; in a word, the love of a wife to refine our sentiments, to fortify our energy, and to better our character. And with the wife's love, the love of our children. Who can ignore the educating power that emanates from the sentiment of paternity? And why should we, from whom the duty of honesty and straightforwardness is more required than from the others, why should we be deprived of these most efficacious means of moral education?"

Outside the Church, there is no more religion; or, what there is of it, is, to a large extent, a form of religion, without the power of true Christian godliness.

In some places matters are still worse; and the forms which religion assumes there, are almost incredible, unless one has actually seen them. In the summer of 1911 two popular leaflets were widely circulated in Genoa when cholera was raging; the one was entitled: "A Prayer to St. Martha for protection from cholera." It began: "I am Martha, Christ's hostess. Whoever trusts in me shall be freed from the epidemic. The power to impart this grace I have received from Christ, the Lord." Then followed several other prayers, and at the end was the instruction: "To be carried about on one's person." The leaflet cost one cent. The other bore the inscription: "Wonderful effects of the water of St. Ignatius. It is a simple, natural water, called after St. Ignatius, because it has been blessed with one of his relics." Then followed an enumeration of the wonderful cures effected by this water in all epidemics from 1656 to the present time, followed by the instruction: "In using this water, the Lord's prayer or a prayer to the Saint may be repeated." At the end was the intimation: "The water of St. Ignatius is to be obtained in the vestry of the Church of 'The Five Wounds' " (a Church of the Jesuit fathers). A sadder and more miserable spectacle could hardly be witnessed than that presented by the numbers of people of all ranks of society, all provided with bottles or flasks, rushing to obtain the precious liquid, and who, after having made their voluntary offer-

ings to the Jesuit on duty at the vestry, obtained a liquid which was, after all, only water from a very ordinary source, into which a bone of the Saint had been immersed. But the awful monstrosity of it all lies in this: that the two leaflets bore the *Imprimatur* of the ecclesiastical authorities; which means that those authorities had seen the leaflets, had read them, had approved of them, and had authorized their distribution.

And what shall we say of the so-called snow-ball, a formula of prayer to be recited nine days, and then handed on to nine other devotees, who in their turn hand them on to nine more, and so on, of course, increasing the efficacy of the prayer? What of the South of Italy, where in several places penitents have to clean the church with their tongue, from the door to the high altar, or with their tongue to make crosses on the ground until it bleeds, or have to go on their knees from their homes to the church? Where in Cathedrals the preachers, sent to fight Protestant heresy, in order to show their rage pretend to wound themselves with all kinds of instruments invented for the purpose, and in their pulpits make saints and Madonnas say *yes* or *no*, laugh or weep, according to their pleasure? Where, just as once religion was intimately connected with brigandage, nowadays it is intimately connected with the *camorra* and the *mafia*?

Is it to be wondered at if the more intelligent and honest members of the clergy feel bound to take the matter in hand and to think of the future of the Church? Listen to what a large group of priests say in a letter addressed to Pius X. "Our society has now for many years held aloof from the Church, which is looked upon as an ancient and inexorable foe. The old cathedrals, which the piety of free, believing peoples in the Middle Ages raised to the Virgin and to Patron Saints, are utterly deserted; men no longer care to draw from religion the strength and light necessary to the soul agitated by daily struggles; respect and veneration for all that has been held most sacred from the cradle, have vanished. And not that

alone, but the Church is considered an obstacle to the happiness of nations; the priest is insulted in public as a common, ignorant parasite; the Gospel and Christianity are regarded as expressions of a decayed civilization, because they are entirely insufficient to respond to the ideals of freedom, justice and science which are shaking the masses." And after having pointed out the great evils that harass the Church in our days, they exclaim: "We are not rebels! We are sincere Catholics; and, as such, we desire to stand up for the salvation of Christianity." And think for a moment of the miserable condition which the modern papacy is reduced to, from the point of view of its authority, and compare it with the power and grandeur which it enjoyed in past centuries. Just take the following example, among a hundred which I might quote. Pius X will be recorded in the history of the Roman Church as the Pope who has been the least obeyed of them all. The papal utterances of the last Popes were, more or less, listened to in the Church; those of Pius X are not only not listened to, but, what is worse still, they raise protests, rebellion, insubordination, wherever they are enjoined. Nearly every papal *Motu proprio* is followed by a storm of disapproval, which ends in killing it. Seven of those utterances, issued within the last few years, will remain famous. That imposing the first communion on children of six years of age, which has proved to be in-applicable in every land; that concerning the centenary of St. Carlo Borromeo, which, for its virulent language against the Reformation, raised a storm among the Roman Catholics of all Protestant countries; that concerning the suppression of the feast days of Patron Saints; that against modernists, which has fostered the cause of Modernism in a way nothing else could have done; that with regard to the garb of the priests, which nobody took any notice of; that referring to the special language to be used in the mass and in other religious services in Austria and in the Orient, which was rejected by all the parish priests of those

countries; lastly, that by which a Roman Catholic was forbidden, under threat of excommunication, to cite a priest before any court without the previous regular permission of the ecclesiastical authority, against which Germany rebelled, and the papal *Motu proprio* became a dead letter.

Those are only seven examples of papal utterances come to naught; but how many similar private and personal ones, directed by the Pope, separately and confidentially, to bishops, heads of religious orders, societies, congregations, writers, etc., might be recorded, which have had the same fate as the seven already quoted!

Listen also to the grave words uttered only recently by Leone Caetani, whom I have already quoted: "The Roman Church has forgotten her old, popular traditions, and has ceased to exercise her beneficent reforming influence into which she stimulated progress and every moral improvement, and which was her principal "raison d'être" in the early centuries. She lives no longer, as she did once upon a time, for the protection of the poor and the humble against the rich and the powerful. She herself has become worldly, rich, powerful, and only tries to keep her present condition unchanged; she shrinks from all innovations; and to the poor and the humble ones she preaches.....resignation to their destiny. Deprived as she is of fresh and youthful vigor, or power to adapt and develop herself, benumbed after so many centuries of existence, and now threatened by a last and deadly blow, the Church does not know what to do except to repeat ecclesiastical and theological formulas, at least one thousand and six hundred years old, formulas that are in sharp contrast with the deepest moral needs of the present moment. The ignorant popular masses of the country and those in certain regions least touched by modern culture, are still faithfully attached to the Church, just as they were in past centuries; and their attachment to her is explained by the fact that their spirit is still what it used to be a thousand or more years ago.

And in that fact lies her intrinsic weakness, for it is in the cultivated classes that the elevating power is to be found of true religion, which must be the religion of all, and not only of the most ignorant and miserable."

Such being the condition of things, is it to be wondered at if the modernist movement has broken out?

But I have said that another reason of this revolutionary movement, is to be found in Protestant influence.

During the last sixty years, evangelical churches and evangelical educational institutions have been established from the Alps to the far end of Sicily; charity works have been founded, while the "Tract Society for Italy" has inundated the country with polemic, apologetic, ethical and doctrinal tracts and books, and the London and Scottish Bible Societies have sent their colporteurs throughout the peninsula, selling thousands and thousands of copies of the Holy Word every year. Now, is it credible that all this huge combined work should be found to exercise no influence whatever on the Roman Catholic Church in Italy? It would be possible to show that a larger and deeper influence might have been exercised, had our first missionaries in Italy understood each other better; but the fact is, that, in spite of all human weakness, a great influence has indeed been exercised by Protestantism on the Roman Church of Italy. The following are the proofs of this influence.

I have often thought that if all the presidents of various Protestant missions in Italy and all the ministers of the different churches were to collect all the correspondence they have had in the past and still have with Roman Catholic priests and friars, Christian literature would be enriched by many volumes of most interesting and important psychological studies. I have a huge pile of those letters myself, and I like to go over them again and again; their repeated perusal enables me to enter better into a deeper fellowship with a crowd of struggling souls, mourning over the present condition of the church they love, and longing for a purifying breath from on high and

for a general revival of her spiritual life. Some of them would like to leave their Church and join us in our missionary work; but by far the greater number of them want to remain where they are, so as to work for a renovation within the Church; if they come to us, it is only to get sympathy, comfort and advice. Besides this, the cultured Italian modernists find their spiritual nourishment in Protestant literature; our best books are to be found in their private libraries, either in their original tongue, or in translations; and in their writings, in their sermons, in their modernistic utterances, the influence of French Protestant literature especially is evident.

Sometime ago I was struck by the fact that there seemed to be a revival in the interest shown by the public in Christian preaching in the Roman Catholic Church of Italy. Some names were mentioned with great respect; in such churches, where a special course of sermons was being delivered, the attendance grew day by day; some preachers attracted not only old men and women, but young folk, thinking men, professors, officers in the army. All this filled my heart with joy, and I began to make inquiries. I went about myself, and engaged some friends, who I knew were as interested in the subject as I was, to make inquiries. We soon found out that nearly all the preachers who attracted people in great numbers, were either modernists or men with new and broad ideas, large hearts, and of wide sympathy, and that they attracted many hearers by their new style of preaching. They never assaulted Protestantism in the rabid, unjust, absurd way of the ordinary orthodox sermonizer; they had abandoned the old fables concerning the immorality of Luther, the heartlessness of Calvin and the conviviality of Zwingli, which had been the "*pièces de résistance*" of the old monks; they took a text from the Word of God, they quoted it in the language understood by the people, they applied it to the religious and moral needs of their hearers, and all this was in simple language, in a pure and unpretentious style; and the people, who had tired of

the conventional, high-flown, empty preaching of the ordinary friars, took a great fancy to this natural, spiritual, nourishing and conversational method of address. I went further in my inquiries. I wrote right and left to the preachers I knew, and asked them to help me in my researches; and here are some of the answers I received from different parts of Italy. One wrote: "My evangelical sermons have stirred up the old clerical circles, in an incredible way. They have tried in all ways to defame me, but have not succeeded. The most enlightened priests and friars and the most cultured men in town have defended me with all their might. I have done my best to be always theologically correct, avoiding dangerous pitfalls and limiting myself to affirming most energetically the fundamental truths of the Gospel." Another, from a distant town, ended his most interesting letter with these sympathetic words: "How I love your French evangelical preachers! I am their spiritual son. I am just now engaged in a very unpleasant piece of work. Two Protestant ladies wish to be instructed by me to enable them to enter the Church of Rome. Naturally, I cannot refuse to do it; but I feel sorry for them. What a folly to bid good-bye to one's holy freedom in order to accept the yoke of the Church of Rome—a yoke we ourselves are scarcely able to bear any longer. What I teach them is the Gospel of Christ, which, up to the present, they have, spiritually speaking, completely ignored. If, with the help of God, I succeed in putting them into personal contact with the Saviour, I think it matters very little what church they belong to." In a Lombard town I had heard a striking address, which strongly reminded me of some French sermon I must have heard or read, but which I had forgotten. As soon as I came back to Florence, I wrote to the preacher, who answered me thus: "Yes, I do not wonder that my sermon brought you, as you say, 'a breath of your native air.' I tell you frankly, the Roman Catholic models of preaching have had no influence whatever on me; the French and Swiss Protestant

preachers, such as Vinet, Adolphe, Horace and Wilfred Monod, Babut, Coquerel père et fils, Charles Wagner, and many others, have been and are my teachers, my models, my inspirers, and the makers of what I am."

Is all this not quite sufficient to show that Protestant influence has had a large part in the preparation of the modernist movement?

That is the actual psychological condition of the best men in the Roman Catholic clergy; in other words, of the men who study, think and reason, who live in contact not only with the dead but with the living, not only with ideas but with facts. It is the condition of those who have a modern soul, and live in close touch with the modern mind, and who are called every day and every hour to respond to the needs of the modern conscience. An abyss lies between the Vatican and this clergy; the words which come to them from the Vatican are the words of the Scribes and Pharisees; they are no longer the words of authority and power. These men are grieved to see the formalism, the paganism, the superstition into which the Church has fallen; they have no longer confidence in a Curia that has completely lost all sense of the things that are of God; this part of the clergy, I say, believe and live, spiritually speaking, because they love the gospel, and because hypercritical doubts have not destroyed in their hearts the hunger and thirst for that mystical union with the Christ of God, in which lies the secret of true piety and of every faithful endeavor. But this part of the clergy love the Church, the Church in which they were born, the Church to which they have consecrated the best years of their lives. That Church, with its episcopal ritual, its strong ecclesiastical organization, its glorious traditions, with its majestic Cathedrals erected to God by the piety of former generations, is the Church which seems to them best able to respond to the genius and temperament of the Latin races. These priests desire to supply the void now felt in that episcopal form, by filling it with something genuinely Christian; they desire to be re-

inspired with the Spirit of Christ; they desire to see God worshipped again "in spirit and in truth." From time to time some earnest soul, having lost faith in these ideals, and driven by an imperious impulse of conscience, crosses the border and comes over to us, under our standard; and we receive him with open arms. We hold such to be men of character, who do not trifle with their conscience. But for one who crosses the line, hundreds, thousands remain in the fold; and remaining, grieve, but believe and hope. One of them writes me: "If you could see what is happening in our midst, you would not believe the testimony of your own eyes." Are they wrong? Who would venture to say so?

I love this clergy, which finds itself in much the same position, with regard to the Vatican, as our Italian patriots did during the wretched time of our political slavery. Sometimes I think of its members as organizing themselves into secret circles, and forming a great and powerful spiritual *Carboneria*; dividing themselves, as Young Italy did, into so many Committees, depending upon a Central Committee, which would issue the secret journal that would feed the flame. I dream of this new Carboneria enclosing the whole peninsula within its net; spreading over mountains and seas; hastening with words and writings the hour of freedom. I seem to see the sacred fire attacking the laity, by means of conventicles, the secret Press and the Confessional, until God raises a modern Spartacus to summon them all to the harvest, to give the slaves the signal of revolt, to face the terrified Curia with the alternative: "Either become Christian, or die," and to lead the Church out of the land of the Pharaohs to the Canaan of freedom and life.

I know the objection to all this; it has been repeated so often, and in every key. It is: "You have no right to criticise the Curia; it is logical, consistent; the illogical and inconsistent are the others, the rebels. Pius X, in his Syllabus and in his Encyclicals and in all his allocutions, expresses faithfully, consistently with the past, and

in prevision of the future, the official views of the Church. The clergy, which has received Holy Orders in and for the Church, has a choice of only two ways: It must accept those views, or go; the third way selected by those who, while not accepting those views remain and conspire, is the way of rebellion, and the Pope is perfectly right in inflicting upon such all the disciplinary punishment which he possesses."

"He is right," they say. Then, in times of political or moral bondage, it is no longer true that there remains to man, as God has made him, the sacred right of rebellion? It is no longer true that right is not always on the side of the strong, but much more often on that of the weak? When majorities rule unjustly, there remains no longer to the minority who aspires to truth and justice, the right to hope and prepare for their emancipation?

Not long ago I had occasion to go to the Vatican for some special research. In the court of St. Damaso, through a curious combination of circumstances, I found myself in the midst of a crowd of pilgrims from Tuscany. I was carried along by the crowd, and found myself in the presence of Pius X, and I heard his address. It was divided into three parts. In the first, he recalled and applied to the various circumstances of life, the motto of his pontificate—"Instaurare omnia in Christo"—and recommended with great warmth the study not of the Gospel, but of the Catechism, as the only means of attaining to the "restoring of all things in Christ," as he always erroneously interprets St. Paul's passage. In the second, replying to an allusion to the Modernists made by Cardinal Maffi in his speech, he said: "I thank you for your sympathy; yes, I have suffered much on account of these * * * 'traitor sons,' as you, your Eminence, have called them. What shall I call them? Shall I say the word? They are sons of the devil!" In the third part he spoke exactly as follows: "And now I will impart to you my benediction, and with this benediction I intend to bless you, and any object of devotion that you may have on

your persons. You need not take them out. Keep them in your pockets; the efficacy of the benediction is the same. And this means that if a crucifix, for example, which you may be carrying to-day, is at any future time, even a very distant future, pressed to the lips of a dying man, that man will enjoy the benefit of all the indulgences and have the entrance into Paradise made easy for him."

The Cardinals who accompanied the Pope looked tired and bored; the Court was inattentive, and showed no interest whatever in what they heard and saw; the guards of honor gazed at the frescoes on the ceiling, and longed for the end of the proceedings. I left the Vatican thoughtful, disillusioned, sad; and recalling the words of the Pope, said to myself: "How symptomatic is that speech! In the first part, all of Christianity that has remained in the system; an idea great in itself, but sprung from a Scriptural passage erroneously interpreted, and founded not on the granite rock of the Gospel, but on the cardboard foundation of an antiquated Catechism. In the second, a negation of the spirit of Christian charity, and a protest against every human and elementary spirit of tolerance. In the third, an absolute denial of what is most clear and vitally Christian in the gospel. Now, this imperceptible residue of Christianity which remains, is too small and lifeless to keep Romanism alive. Even Romanism will have to bow before the unalterable law of the moral world, which is the law of the "survival of the fittest"; and, in the moral world, the "fittest" are not the most ancient, or the best organized, or the most numerous, but *the best*. The Colossus of the Vatican, whom many insistently consider to be eternal, will undoubtedly fall, as many other and most important Colossi have fallen before. And in the same way as St. Augustine said of Imperial Rome: *Suâ se magnitudine fregit* (it went to pieces on account of its greatness), the historian who is privileged to record the fact for future generations, will say of Papal Rome: *Se fregit suâ pervicaciâ* (it went to pieces on account of its stubbornness).

CHRIST'S RESURRECTION AND THE FATHER.

BY REV. W. E. HENRY, TWIN FALLS, IDAHO.

Few readers of John's Gospel have failed to note with wonder the seventeenth and eighteenth verses of the tenth chapter, and the careful student is likely to have come back to them from time to time with ever deepening awe. They read as follows: "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I of my Father."

The passage is unique. There are other Scriptures which confirm its teachings, but no single passage speaks so fully and clearly concerning these hidden things of God. The uniqueness of the passage will therefore doubtless justify, and the importance of its teachings certainly demands, a few observations as to the general character of the writing in which the words occur.

It was not without reason that the beloved disciple had leaned upon the bosom of the Master. He was so constituted as to be peculiarly appreciative of spiritual things. This is remarkably evident in the writings which bear his name. In ancient days his Gospel was designated as "the Gospel according to the Spirit," and a recent writer of unusual insight has described it as "the history of Jesus read as a chapter in the life of God."¹ In it "we rise to heaven, and go back to 'the beginning,' and set forth from 'the bosom of the Father.'"² Moreover this marvellous portrayal of things divine is in language so exquisitely beautiful and fitting that Westcott has termed it "the divine Hebrew Epic."³

¹ Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 340.

² Bernard, *Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament*, p. 45.

³ Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, p. 275.

But the character of the contents and the style of John's Gospel are no more worthy of attention in this connection than the time and circumstances of its composition. It should always be borne in mind that John wrote last of all the New Testament writers. A period of probably ten to fifteen years had intervened since the last letter of the great Apostle to the Gentiles had appeared. The other Gospels had been in the hands of the churches for periods varying from (probably) five to twenty-five years. Practically the whole New Testament was in permanent form, and had been for at least five years, before John began to write.

Moreover, the conditions were such that John could hardly have been ignorant of the contents of these writings. Located as he doubtless was for many years at Ephesus, where Paul labored so zealously for three years, he must have been fully acquainted with the teachings of this great gospel pioneer not only as retained in the memory of the Ephesians, but also as presented in the epistle bearing this name. Furthermore, Ephesus was "one of the three great cities of the East Mediterranean lands."⁴ It "had established itself in undisputed supremacy as the sea-end of the great eastern highway,"⁵ and "was one of the knots where many side roads converged to feed the main route."⁶ "The system of roads was such as to make the city the most accessible from all quarters of Asia."⁷ Is it conceivable that the various writings of the New Testament would be in the possession of churches year after year without the activity of the period bringing either copies of the document, or at least reliable reports of their contents to the church of such an important and easily accessible city? And can such have come to the church at Ephesus and John have remained without knowledge of them? It is far easier to be-

⁴ Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible*; Article "Ephesus."

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

lieve that virtually the whole New Testament was known at Ephesus during John's sojourn there, either in manuscript or by first-hand reports as to the contents of such, and that John was first in the church with respect to knowledge as well as authority. There need be little wonder indeed that the view early obtained currency that John wrote his Gospel expressly to supplement the earlier Gospels. And even though this position may by some be regarded as "entirely untenable," the facts certainly do warrant us in taking John's teachings as a sort of corrective of those that had gone before. Not that he felt compelled to refute anything that had been written, but that he aimed rather to restore the balance of doctrine. In the divine wisdom "One Apostle, the first and the last of the 'glorious company,' was chosen as the chief instrument for the settling of human thought, defeating the wiles of the devil and certifying the witness of God."⁸

But these few sentences with respect to the character of this "Valedictory Discourse,"⁹ as one has beautifully termed John's Gospel, must suffice. It seemed very necessary, however, that its relatively late date and unequalled spiritual insight be thus briefly presented in order that due consideration might be accorded to the teaching of the verses in hand. For they deal with the profoundest things—the relation of the Father to the Son; of the Son to His own death and resurrection; and the bearing of these events on the relation of Father to Son. Nothing can be holier than these things, and nothing can more require surpassing spiritual discernment and reverent study for adequate appreciation.

If, now, these verses be questioned as to which of the profound things they mention is made most emphatic, it must certainly be agreed that it is the bearing of the resurrection of our Lord on the relation of the Father

⁸ Bernard, as above, p. 68.

⁹ Reynolds, in *A Dictionary of the Bible*; Article "Gospel of John."

to the Son. And if we seek still more carefully to know how the resurrection affected the relation of the Father to the Son, they will present to us at least three great truths.

1. A FULFILMENT OF THE FATHER'S COMMAND.

The resurrection was a fulfilment of the Father's command. "This commandment," said the Master, "received I from my Father."

Scholars are not agreed as to when the "commandment" here spoken of was received. Some say it was received "at the time of the incarnation." This view seems intolerable, however. It is far easier to accept the view of Prof. Milligan that "It is the whole 'commandment' of the Father, as given to the Son in the counsels of eternity, that is here referred to!"¹⁰

In these simple words, then, we are carried back beyond the confines of time, back until the material universe has yet to be. The curtain of the remote past is drawn aside and we look down the vistas of the eternal ages. And the gaze makes us dizzy. From generation to generation man has been and still is striving to trace the path of God in time. The innate powers of the soul will not suffer him to rest.¹¹ Slowly and with surpassing

¹⁰ Milligan, *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, p. 123. Dr. Henry C. Mabie in speaking of "Christ's Reconciling Death," says: "In harmony with such a situation, I do not see how any moral shock can be felt, even by the most sensitive, when it is said that with a direct view to such suffering and dying, Jesus came into the world; for it was in view of such self-sacrifice on the part of God that the world itself was brought into being."—*The Meaning and Message of the Cross*, p. 83.

¹¹ In truth those whose lives are given up to the mere pursuit of physical enjoyment recognize in calm moments that they are not attaining enduring satisfaction for the soul. And those who, with higher aims, seek truth and goodness through the efforts of thought and will in science and right action, although their lives are the more noble and do attain enduring satisfaction, yet must recognize, just because they earnestly pursue noble objects, that the goal of perfect Truth and Holiness seems far beyond them, and inaccessible by their own unaided efforts. Hence it is not merely the hampering external conditions of life,—physical, economic, and social,—that seem to shut our

toil, perhaps, but nevertheless with increasing certainty, if not also rapidity, he has been thinking God's thoughts after Him. With every acquisition of truth the mighty plans of the Creator as manifested in the "things that are made" have appeared vaster and vaster until we stand amazed. But the magnitude of these plans displayed in time develops into infinitude when we perceive that they form but a part—we know not how small a part—of the designs of eternity. And the amazement we feel in contemplation of the former passes into a feeling of utter impotency as we look upon the latter. We are like a babe blinking in the light of its first day.

But while we cannot fathom all the mysteries involved in God's eternal plans, we can recognize and seek to appreciate the facts so kindly revealed to us with regard to them. Nor need entire uncertainty attend our efforts. Our earth-born sense of time and space may become confused, so that we cannot tell exactly the when and where of what we see, but confusion as to when and where is not necessarily confusion as to what. The substance of the revelation can be discerned at least in part. The midnight lightning flash does not afford a good perspective, but it does make some things sure. So also this flash of the divine search-light into the depths of eternity may not enable us precisely to locate what we see, but it does make us sure that we see something, and sure also of something that we see.

The inner life of God is exposed to view. For a fleeting moment, as it were, we are permitted to look upon

souls from the satisfaction of their deepest longings. It is rather something in the nature of the soul itself—a something which gives it power to feel and think the infinite or perfect in truth and goodness and beauty, but does not bring the power to attain these ideals under the present conditions of existence. The realization of its visions by the spirit of man seems hampered on the one hand by this "muddy vesture of decay" which it must inhabit; but, on the other hand, it seems to be an essential characteristic of the human spirit that its visions must always reach far beyond its attainments, that its imagination must transcend the actual power of thought to grasp the truth, and its ethical ideals forever pass the limits of its will and power to realize goodness. —Leighton, *Jesus Christ and the Civilization of To-day*, pp. 122, 123.

that sweet fellowship and intimate communion which the Son enjoyed with the Father "before the world was." And in that momentary glance we discern more than that time is chained to eternity. The welfare of the world stands forth as the care of the heart of God. Before light shined forth over primeval chaos the plans of God concerning men had been matured. The Son had been commissioned not only to create but to save.

Moreover, in this latter work two things appear of special importance. The Son is charged first to die and then to rise again from the dead. The two are inseparable, and yet in the mind of God they are not of equal value. Any careful study of the passage makes it unmistakably evident that the emphasis lies upon the resurrection rather than upon the death. It is not His dying that occupies the chief place in this commission of the Son, but His taking again of life. Indeed, in the divine mind the latter is the very end for which the former came to be—"I lay down my life, that (in order that) I may take it again." "The words of our Lord Himself thus teach us that, in the original commandment of His Father, not death but resurrection from the power of death, together with the life which followed, was the true goal of that race which He was to run, the true completing of the obedience which in the scheme of redemption He was to render;" that the taking again of His life was to be the "*ultimate act* in which both the will of the Father and the free adoption of that will by the Son are manifested."¹²

Few words are needed to make clear how different this view of the resurrection is from that ordinarily held today. Not only have we lost the biblical conception of our Lord's resurrection as the most important feature of His redemptive work, but we have almost lost all conception of it as even in any sense an essential part of that work. It is not that the death of Christ has been over

¹² Milligan, as above, pp. 123, 124.

emphasized. It is not possible for finite minds to lay too much stress upon the death of the Son of God for the sins of men. But the trouble lies here: While the death of Christ has been given great prominence in the thought of the Church, His resurrection, which should have been given still greater prominence, has been comparatively ignored. The Church of Christ has perhaps no greater need today than that the resurrection of her Lord should be restored to its proper place in her thought and life. If, as the history of Christian doctrine seems to show, the thought of the Church can deal specially with only one of the fundamental truths of Christianity at a time, it is to be hoped the point has been reached at which attention will be centered upon the resurrection of Christ until this "eminent act of God's omnipotency" shall stand forth in all its intended prominence and power. Nor need it surprise us if such enthroning of the doctrine of the resurrection should mean such a quickening of the people of God as the world has not yet seen. How can a realization of the risen Christ come to us apart from a realization of the reigning Christ? And what can this last mean but an enduement of power from on high?

At the first glance this view of the resurrection will probably appear to be somewhat opposed to Paul's teaching as to the relative importance of our Lord's death and resurrection. The difference is, however, more seeming than real. Paul did lay great stress on Christ's death for our sins, but he also emphasized the fact that He rose again for our justification. He determined to glory in nothing "save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," but his message everywhere, as at Athens, was "Jesus and the resurrection." He had "determined not to know anything" among the Corinthians "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified," but he vehemently insisted that if Christ had not risen from the dead the faith of these same converts was "vain," they were yet in their sins.¹³ Paul

¹³ 1 Cor. 15:17.

nowhere more strongly asserts the absolute necessity of Christ's death than he here asserts the necessity of His resurrection. Indeed, to the Romans Paul strongly reiterates Christ's words: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."¹⁴ Paul may have spoken more frequently of Christ's death, but he by no means lost sight of His resurrection. In reality our thought that John and Paul differ about the importance of the resurrection grows largely out of our failure to appreciate what Paul has taught. We have been so absorbed in the other great truths he left us that our eyes have been largely blinded to this. The teaching of the Word is one teaching, and we would show a superior wisdom were we to attribute the discrepancies we see more to our snail-like grasp of truth and less to the personalities of those men who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

2. A GROUND OF THE FATHER'S LOVE.

But the resurrection of our Lord was more to the Father than simply a fulfilment of this commandment given in the counsels of eternity. It also formed a ground of the Father's love to the Son. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again." This is the central thought of the passage. All others are subordinate and complementary. They run into this one as spokes into the hub of a wheel. And it is indeed a great thought—one of the very greatest ever given to the minds of men. Probably the sublimest truth of revelation is the tri-unity of the Godhead. This thought, like the one above, involves this sublimest truth. But while the revelation above considered called attention to the dealings of the First Person of the Trinity with the Second, this passes beneath these divine

¹⁴ Rom. 8:34.

transactions and directs attention to the very foundation of the crowning passion of the Father's heart in its outgoings towards the Son. These words lead us to the very center of the inner circle of the life of God, and bid us consider how an event in time can have played such an important part in the affairs of Deity.

It is impossible for us to eliminate from our thinking the idea of succession. For us things occur one after another. Tennyson recognizes the fact, and probably traces it to its proper source:

“But we that are not all,
As parts, can see but part, now this, now that,
And live, perforce, from thought to thought, and make
One act a phantom of succession; thus
Our weakness somehow shapes the shadow, Time.”

“One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day,” and it is probably true that “For God all is one and at once.” But whether this be true or not the acceptance of His command by the Son was to the Father the equivalent of its performance. We promise and are not able to perform. But if in the language of the Godhead there be a future tense, it differs in no wise from the present. When the Son said to the Father in the bosom of past eternity, “I will” (and we are really compelled to conceive it so), all things involved were thenceforth as certain as if He had said, “I have done.” Divine might and unchanging faithfulness were in the words. Equally as in creative times the Son spake and it was so.

Passing, then, from this unimportant difficulty as to time, the great question still remains, How can the resurrection have constituted a ground of the Father's love to the Son? Any trustworthy reply to this question must, of course, be a matter of pure revelation. No other source of knowledge can afford any consideration worthy

of credence. If the Word has not spoken, we must be content to accept the great truth without explanation. If, on the other hand, the Word has spoken, we ought, with minds open to receive its fullest teachings, most reverently to examine its message. A careful study of the passage under consideration fully convinces one that there is truth that may be gleaned.

3. OUR LORD'S PART IN HIS OWN RESURRECTION.

The resurrection formed a ground of the Father's love because of our Lord's part therein. It was because of what our Lord did in this great transaction that the Father loved Him. Inquiry as to Jesus' part in His own resurrection shows that it consisted in

(1) The acceptance of further sacrifice for men. Watkins says with respect to the seventeenth verse, "the key to the meaning is in the truth that for Christ the taking again of human life is itself a further sacrifice, and that this is necessary for the completion of the Great Shepherd's work." Meyer says: "The ground of the love of God lies not merely in the sacrifice (of his death), considered by itself, but in the fact that the Good Shepherd, when he gives up his life, is resolved to take it again, in order that he may continue to fulfil his pastoral office till the final goal is reached, when all mankind shall constitute his flock." Each of these views presents a phase of the truth, but neither seems entirely true. Watkins rightly designates that which forms the ground of the Father's love as "a further sacrifice," but appears erroneously to locate that sacrifice entirely in the taking again of human nature. The taking again of human nature may have been in itself a further sacrifice for our Lord, but it does not exhaust that element in the resurrection. Meyer correctly places greater emphasis on the resurrection as a means to the work which Christ needed yet to perform, but errs, if, as it seems, he is unwilling

to designate the ground of the Father's love as a "further sacrifice." Christ has not yet ceased His redemptive work, and all His redemptive work is sacrificial in character. The resurrection, therefore, and that part of His redeeming work which follows it are of the same character as the whole. If any element of sacrifice is to be found in His teaching men before His death, the same element is certainly to be found in His teaching men after His resurrection. If any element of sacrifice is to be found in His prayers for His followers before He gave up the ghost, the same element cannot be denied to His work of intercession which still continues. If there is ever to be an end of our Lord's sacrificial work, it is assuredly yet to come, and is not to be found in His resurrection. This event, glorious as it was, involved for Him, the infinite One, yet further sacrifice, and an important element of Jesus' share in His own resurrection was the willing acceptance of this additional sacrifice.

But in the resurrection our Lord did more than simply accept further sacrifice for men; He also (2) put forth energy. This is a statement of greater importance than at first sight appears, and we do well to look rather carefully at the evidence for it.

The synoptics afford proof of it, but in a way not calculated to attract the attention of a casual reader. They must be looked at rather carefully before it comes to view, but it is no less convincing when once seen. The writers of the synoptics use two verbs to express our Lord's resurrection. Matthew uses one word seven times, the other once. Mark uses Matthew's preferred word three times, the other, five. Luke shows no preference, using each three times. If we question these words closely as they stand before us in the sacred text, they make it very evident that our Lord's resurrection is conceived of both actively and passively; that is, both as accomplished by Himself and by another. In Matthew's

Gospel the verb occurs six times in the passive voice,¹⁵ once in either the middle or passive¹⁶ (the form is not decisive, but the context makes the middle preferable), and once in the active;¹⁷ in Mark's, twice in the active,¹⁸ twice in the middle,¹⁹ twice in the passive,²⁰ and once in the middle or passive;²¹ in Luke's, twice in the active,²² once in the middle,²³ and three times in the passive.²⁴ Wherever the voice of the verb is either active or middle the resurrection is, of course, conceived of actively; i. e., as accomplished by Christ Himself. There are, then, out of a total of twenty-one passages, at least eight of which our Lord is represented as putting forth energy in His own resurrection, and two others of doubtful significance."²⁵

The evidence in John's Gospel is very explicit and very strong. When, after the first cleansing of the temple, the Jews demanded that the Master should produce evidence of His right to do such things by showing some "sign," "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.—But he spake of the temple of his body."²⁶ It is evidently impossible not to find in this passage a clear and emphatic

¹⁵ 16:21; 17:23, 20:19; 26:32; 28:6, 7.

¹⁶ 27:63.

¹⁷ 17:9.

¹⁸ 8:31; 9:9.

¹⁹ 9:31; 10:34.

²⁰ 14:28; 16:6.

²¹ 16:14.

²² 24:7, 46.

²³ 18:33.

²⁴ 9:22; 24:6, 34.

²⁵ Some further facts are worthy of notice. The two words are *ἐγείρω* and *ἀνίστημι*. The first occurs only in the passive voice—possibly twice in the middle (Matt. 27:63; Mk. 16:14). The second occurs only in the active and middle voices. The first appears in the Received Text twelve times, the second nine. In Matt. 17:23 and Luke 9:22 there is some evidence for *ἀνίστημι* instead of *ἐγείρω*. In Matt. 20:19 *ἐγείρω* is certainly to be preferred to *ἀνίστημι*, and there is strong evidence that such a substitution should be made in 17:9. Ammonius says: *ἀναστῆναι καὶ ἐγερθῆναι διαφέρει· ἀναστῆναι μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ ἔργον,*
²⁶ 2:19, 21.

attribution to Christ of an active share in His own resurrection. As Bishop Pearson says: "If, upon the resurrection of Christ, the apostles believed those words of Christ,—then did they believe that Christ raised himself; for in those words there is a person named which raised Christ and no other person mentioned but himself."²⁷ Nor can the same teaching be denied to the passage under consideration. Christ is here represented as saying, "I have power to lay it (his life) down, and I have power to take it again." And while it is true that the word here translated "power" is better rendered "authority," it must not be forgotten that it involves the idea of *might* as well as *right*. The teaching is neither simply that Jesus possessed the *right* to lay down His life and to take it again, nor simply that He possessed the *might* so to do; but rather that He possessed both right *and* might.

Moreover, this idea is not altogether wanting in Paul's writings. One passage in particular merits consideration, viz., Col. 2:13-15. Most commentators take the view that in this passage God is the nominative in verse 13, but Christ in verses 14 and 15. Ellicott contends that Christ is the subject throughout, and assigns what seem to be conclusive reasons for his view. These may be stated as follows: (1) The logical difficulty of supplying a nominative from the subordinate genitive of verse 12; (2) The obvious prominence given to Christ throughout the preceding verses; (3) The peculiar acts described in the participles (especially the first in verse 14); (4) The relation of Christ to the principalities and powers (verse 15; cf. 1:16; 2:10); (5) The extreme difficulty of referring the acts described in verses 14 and 15 to God the Father.²⁸ If this view be correct, as it doubtless is, then there can be no question that Paul also recognized the fact that Christ "as of the same essence and

²⁷ Quoted by Ellicott, *The Life of Christ*, p. 332, note.

²⁸ See Commentary, in loc.

power with the Father and the Holy Ghost, did infallibly quicken himself." In connection with this passage should be considered also 1 Thess. 4:14, concerning which another says, "Paul speaks of Christ's dying and rising as if both acts were of his own choice and power;" 2 Cor. 5:15; and Acts 17:13.

One element more in our Lord's part in His own resurrection remains to be considered. His acceptance of further sacrifice and putting forth of divine energy were crowned by (3) a voluntary submission to the Father's will. And this last is probably the chief reason why the resurrection formed a ground of the Father's love to the Son.

Such willing submission to the Father's will characterized the whole career of the Son as we know it. He had always His eye, as F. B. Meyer puts it, "closely fixed on the dial-plate of the Father's will, following the index finger of His purpose, waiting till it should reach the hour, and the alarm for action should ring out."²⁹ He Himself declared, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work; I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father which has sent me; for I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me."³⁰ And the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents Him as saying, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God."³¹

Now this voluntary submission to the Father's will which marked the whole life of the Master marked in a peculiarly important and impressive manner His resurrection. He laid down His life that He might take it again. And He did this of His own free will, for He had power to lay it down and power to take it again. But it was all a "commandment" which He had received of the Father. And His obedience to this "commandment" was

²⁹ *The Life and Light of Men*, p. 60.

³⁰ Jno. 4:34; 5:30; 6:38.

³¹ 10:7.

a leading, if not the chief, "part of that doing of the Father's will in which the free and perfect submission of the Son to the Father was so conspicuously exhibited as to form the very foundation of the eternal love with which the Father loved the Son."³²

This is a great and comprehensive truth, and perhaps some will think that this submission of the Son to the Father is a sufficient ground of the Father's love, and therefore makes unnecessary the other elements noticed as forming a part of our Lord's share in His own resurrection. But such cannot be. The very thought of submission to the will of another involves the thought of something endured or done, or both endured and done, by the one so submitting. If Christ in His resurrection showed His submission to the Father's will, He must have either endured or performed, or both endured and performed, something which the Father desired. In reality, as we have seen, He did both; He endured a further sacrifice for men, and wrought mightily in His own resurrection.

³² Milligan, as above, p. 123.

SHOULD A PREACHER PARTICIPATE IN THE POLITICAL LIFE OF HIS COUNTRY? IF SO, WHY AND HOW?

BY ARTHUR YAGER, PH. D., GEORGETOWN, KY.

Our preachers have in the past, neglected this patriotic duty. They have been poor citizens, in this respect, and have not rendered unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's.

It seems to me that there have been two fundamental reasons for this neglect. (1) There is a religious reason: There still lingers in some quarters an old idea of our religion, which makes it appear somewhat inconsistent for a preacher to meddle much with any of the practical affairs of this life—a notion that the chief concern of the preacher was to warn men to flee from the wrath to come, to make their peace with God, to keep that peace largely by disentangling themselves with the affairs of this present world. The preacher's mission was to conserve the spiritual life, and the spiritual life was in direct opposition to the temporal life. Now of all forms of temporal life politics is undoubtedly the worst, the most earthy. That celebrated trio, the world, the flesh, and the devil, have heretofore had more complete charge of our politics than any other earthly concern of equal importance. So the conclusion was obvious—the preacher must absolutely leave it alone.

As an illustration of this old idea of religion in extreme form I will quote the authoritative official definition of our religion found in the circular letter of Elkhorn Association, printed in 1805. "By the religion of Jesus we mean the implantation of the Divine graces of the Holy Spirit, which leads all of the children of God to discover the entire insufficiency of all created enjoyments and human and creature righteousness to make them happy, or accepted with God; discovers to them the suitable-

ness and entire sufficiency of the dear Redeemer, and enables them to believe and rejoice in him as their all in all."

There is here no mention of missions or service or work of any sort, for the bringing in of the Kingdom of God, or the uplifting and purification of this world.

Everybody I think would now admit that this is a one-sided definition of "the religion of Jesus." At any rate our modern religion is far more militant and practical than this. It attacks sin and evil everywhere, not only in the heart of the believer, but also in government, in society, in business and in pleasure. Therefore a preacher of this great religion of Jesus, can not be indifferent to the wrong in politics, or anywhere else.

But there is also a political reason for the attitude of many preachers toward politics, and that is the old democratic, Jeffersonian view of politics, as a matter of small importance in the total life of the country.

Government, according to this view, is regarded as a necessary evil; its operations, therefore, are to be restricted to the narrowest possible limits. As an agent in the common life, it is never to be called on except for the performance of those activities which could not be performed by the people themselves.

In our Federal constitution and State constitutions, drawn up and adopted during the first century of our national life, we have attempted to hedge our governments about with innumerable restrictions; attempting in this way to limit their powers, and cut down their activities as much as we possibly could, and leave the largest part of our affairs free from any intermeddling on the part of the Nation.

It is easy to account historically for this political theory. It was a part of the radical individualistic philosophy which became regnant after the French Revolution. The rights of man became almost a fetish to be worshipped, and it was made to mean almost entire freedom from every kind of restraint. All government everywhere was looked upon with suspicion by our political

forebears. It was regarded as an agency always liable to become inefficient, corrupt and oppressive, dangerous to liberty and to the free life of the individual and of the Church. And our people, therefore, strove to cut it out as much as possible from the untrammelled life of the community. "That government is best which governs least," said Thomas Jefferson; and for a half century after he said it, we struggled to realize that ideal.

We have only recently seen clearly how futile has been that struggle. Government—that is, the political life—has grown in power, in importance, and in the multiplicity of affairs with which it deals, steadily and irresistibly, until now it puts its potent hand upon almost every vital matter connected with our lives. It is easy to show the onward march of governmental work and activity. Take for example, the matter of charity. The Church used to be the great almoner; now it is the City, the County, the State, that does the largest part of this work.

Take for example, the matter of Education. Public education, that is, education supported by the Government, has grown to such proportions that it is now a question as to whether it will not soon lay its doomful hand upon every kind of school in the country, save, perhaps, the Theological Seminary. But perhaps the growth of government activities can be most strikingly illustrated by comparison of the government revenues and expenditures of the present day, with those of 80 or 100 years ago.

The income of the Federal Government before the Civil War never rose above \$50,000,000 annually; while now, for this present year, they will far exceed one billion dollars. Our population is not more than three times as great as then; our expenditures are twenty or thirty times as great.

The budget of every City and State shows the same stupendous tendency to increase. It is futile to try to stop this irresistible tendency, even if we wished to do so, and it is doubtful if we should wish to do it. Govern-

ment is the agency that belongs to all of us, and our obvious duty is to make it represent all of us, and the lesson I will draw from this sketch of the political evolution of our country, is for all of us to try to get into the political game, and make the enormous and increasing influence of government responsive to the best and highest aspirations of the whole community.

But these reasons which in my judgement have tended in the past to keep the Preacher entirely aloof from the politics of the community, have passed away never to return; and there are now many and strong reasons why he should interest himself in that life, and strive to promote its purification and proper development.

In the first place, a preacher is not simply and solely a preacher. He is also a man—a full-rounded, red-blooded man, and a citizen, and he has no warrant for merging in his professional character as a minister, all of his rights and responsibilities and duties as a citizen. “Render unto Cæsar, the things that be Cæsar’s”—not neglecting, of course, the things that belong to God.

We Baptists especially have always contended against sacerdotalism. It is not necessary that a preacher should cease to be a man, and become nothing but a preacher—that he should *dress* his profession, and look his profession, act his profession, and merge even his individuality in his calling.

A minister, in addition to his character as minister, is also usually the head of a family—the owner of property—a member of the body politic; and by virtue of all these social relations, he has political duties which he ought not to shirk.

The early constitution of Kentucky contained a provision that no preacher should ever hold any political office in the Commonwealth. John L. Waller, one of our greatest preachers, who was a member of the third constitutional convention, combatted that provision in one of the strongest and most eloquent arguments ever made in the legislative halls of Kentucky.

Because of his efforts and influence, this provision was wisely cut out of our later constitutions.

The Preacher is coming more and more to be recognized as a great social leader in the community where he lives, and every form of social and moral uplift should appeal to his interests, and command his coöperation. And I shall presently show, nothing is so important to the moral and social life in this 20th century as the purification of politics.

In the second place, the Minister should lend a hand in the political struggles going on about him, because of their great, and ever increasing importance. As stated before, the province of our government can no longer be restricted to a comparatively few concerns. This province is widening year by year, and the government, federal, state, and city, is constantly increasing its activities, and undertaking to render more and more services for the people; and there is no sign that this tendency is soon to be checked. In business, in education, in philanthropy, in the regulation and control of our economic and social life, its powerful hand is seen everywhere. The old individualistic philosophy has given way before the new ideas of the sphere of Government. With this idea in our minds, it would be interesting to sit down and read the platforms of the three great political parties of last year, and compare these with the political platforms of say, 1872, or even 1892. Or, take the recent platform of the Progressive party, and compare it with any other platform ever promulgated by any great political party, in our previous history. And while its ideals have been stigmatized as visionary, and its methods as impractical, let us remember that it rallied to its support about four million voters in its first campaign, not to count the other millions of progressives who voted for other tickets. Now, the fundamental political doctrine underlying all the progressivism of modern politics is, that the Government is a great instrumentality belonging to all the people, and can properly be used by them for the secur-

ing of social justice, for the correction of economic as well as political abuses, and for the moral uplift of society. This doctrine implies that society is an organism with a life and development of its own; and that the Government is its most important organ, through which it can work out its destiny, according to its own ideals. This sort of politicalism—if I may be permitted to coin a word—is simply a modification of modern socialism. By the last word I do not mean all of the technical shibboleths by which the Socialist is distinguished from other reformers; but I mean rather the socialistic spirit which emphasizes the social view-point and calls upon the individual to make personal sacrifices for the social good.

It may be that some of us do not approve of all this clamor for social and economic reform, which has entered into later day politics; but of one thing we may rest assured, our political life will never again be what it has been in the last century. It will be larger, and fuller, of deeper moral significance. In an important sense, society is an organism, unified, integrated, as an evolutionist would say, around its political organization. Every part of it is organically related to every other part, as is so graphically set forth in I Cor. 12, concerning the body of Christ. We can not separate one phase of its life from another; it is not built in water-tight compartments, like a ship, so that one part of it can be dry and clean, and another part flooded with corruption and vice.

This has been abundantly proved by our experience, for we have seen the graft, the greed and the selfishness of our politics overflow and contaminate our business life and our social life everywhere. And the remedy is not to attempt to build dikes against the flood of wrong in our politics, and try thus to localize it, but to carry the war into Africa, and to demand and work for the purification of our political methods. All this constitutes a challenge to the Preacher, to turn his batteries upon the citadel of sin.

In the third place our politics need our preachers sorely. I do not mean by this simply that politics needs the moral purification that preachers might perhaps help to give it, but rather in a philosophical sense our political life sorely needs to have a new life poured into it.

There is need of a new element, the problems need to be attacked from a new direction. I am sure the public mind sees this need. There has been too great a preponderance of the legal element in our public life. In no country in the world have lawyers, as such, had so much influence as in the United States. Ours has sometimes been characterized as a government of lawyers, for lawyers and by lawyers.

And now granting that a Preacher should participate more or less actively in the political life of his country, let us give a brief consideration to the third part of the subject: *How can he do so?*

This is a perplexing problem. How can a minister of the gospel do this thing without hampering and hindering him in his great work as a preacher and pastor? Each one must of course judge of the conditions of his own community, and after he has discerned the voice of conscience, try in some way tactfully to use his great influence for the right. No cast-iron rules can be laid down. It will oftentimes be a delicate and difficult matter, and perhaps sometimes impossible for a preacher to do what he may know to be right, in a heated political campaign, without perhaps causing more injury in other directions than the good that may be accomplished.

I am endeavoring to create a state of thoughtful consideration as to what a preacher, under normal conditions ought to do, if he can, rather than to lay down hard and fast rules of conduct for all situations. But some suggestions may be made that I am sure will be generally helpful. First: Our preachers should of course, like all other citizens, make a careful study of the complicated mechanism through which the government of our great

country is actually carried on. For nothing can be done without a knowledge of the machinery and the methods by which political work is done.

When we consider the entire fabric of American government, federal, state and local, as it has developed through the years, it is by no means a simple combination of political machinery. Our fathers who started it in 1789 when they adopted the great Constitution of the United States were very much under the influence of the philosophy of the universe, produced by the discoveries of Sir Isaac Newton; and they framed a government which was to work somewhat after the analogy of the heavenly bodies, which are balanced in space and move about under the force of gravitation. It was a government of checks and balances consisting of great co-ordinate departments, moving around in orbits of their own, checking, and yet not interfering with one another.

Underneath the Federal Government, the State and City governments were formed on the same model, and all were put together in an inter-locking, and counterbalancing system. Later, and quite unexpectedly, the great system of political parties was built up and superimposed upon the original structure. Our fathers did not provide for this, because they did not anticipate it. In fact they had a deep and abiding distrust for a genuine democracy or rule of the people, as we understand it today. And it is a real rule of the people that makes political parties necessary. Our political parties grew up and worked for almost a century without any warrant for their existence, in the constitution, or in the laws of the land. As they grew in power and organization they developed an almost despotic power over their adherents, and developed at their centers, these political machines, with which we are so familiar at the present day.

Then came the economic evolution of those gigantic corporations, in the mysterious purlieus of which the Big Business hides its demands for special privileges and monopolies. And as the offspring of big business and po-

litical machines, we get the party boss—that most sinister of all the figures in our latter day politics.

These modern products of our political system have played ducks and drakes with the stately machinery of our fathers. They have often paralyzed Executives, thwarted our Courts, dead-locked our Legislatures and Congresses and at every turn hampered and clogged the working of our political machinery.

All of this must be carefully studied and intelligently considered by any citizen who would be useful in the political life of his country. He must know where to begin—where first to take hold, in order to be of any use; and usually the best place to begin is at the bottom—at the precinct primary of his party, where machines are made, and bosses are born. In the second place it is these same political parties with their intense partizanship and rigorous discipline that constitute the chief embarrassment of a minister who would try to serve the cause of righteousness, in a political way. His members belong to both parties, and they usually resent their pastor's participation in the political debate, as an unwarranted intrusion on his part. Moreover, if he belongs to one party, and fails to obey the orders of the machine, he is scorned as a bolter, and his religious influence endangered. But here again our recent history gives us comfort.

I think that it could be shown that now in this year of grace 1913, a clear majority of the voters of our great Republic are bolters, for when we add to the great army of Democrats who have in various recent elections broken away from their party, the four million of Progressives who bolted the nominee of their party, in the last election, we shall have a majority, perhaps, of all the voters in the country.

In fact the great party system which has so long dominated the political life of our country, seems to be almost in ruins. And while it will doubtless be revived, it will be built up along other lines, and upon different principles.

The day of party tyranny is over. Moreover, the rapid introduction of women voters into our system—which seems bound to go on until it has spread over our whole country—will bring a new element into our political life; and inasmuch as it could not make it worse, it must needs improve it.

THE KIND OF A MINISTRY NEEDED TODAY.

BY REV. E. R. PENDLETON, PENSACOLA, FLA.

The minister in any age is a pattern man, called upon to walk a somewhat straighter line than his fellows, and, because he is a professor of idealism, subject to keener criticism from all sorts of people. There has perhaps been little change since the world began in these respects. The ages have changed, and the standards for the ministry have moved up as the people have advanced in ethics. Chrysostom, writing of "The Priesthood," sets forth this identical reason for his hesitancy in entering upon the sacred calling. This makes the minister's position today as unenviable and uncomfortable as it was then. Chrysostom overcame the reluctance, however, became the "Golden Mouthed," and brilliantly helped to make early church history. Many other men who have shrunk from the scrutiny of the multitude have overcome their modesty likewise, and are making church history today.

It is possible that Christian culture which has pushed up the standard of excellence for the ministry has also accentuated its difficulties, and, as so few men can become golden mouthed, a fastidious age has been inclined to undervalue the ordinary ministry. But the minister of today must face a world all too tired of shams. Restless of all sorts of posing in Church and State, and with the leaven of democracy working mightily within, the masses are ready to throw off every thing that smacks of ancient bondage, whether it be monarchy or ecclesiasticism.

Christianity is just as fresh and joyous a message as it ever has been, and there will not be wanting, there never has been wanting, men to preach it with freshness and vigor. Certain types of men are as happy and contented in the ministry as any class of men one can find. It would be difficult to travel far and see a happier lot than some ministers, rooted in the affections of their peo-

ple, strong in the confidence of those without, and in love with their work for men.

This kind will always have the support of the people and will carry the Commission to its finality. But just what kind of men these are required to be is not so easy to tell. It does not seem to be brilliant gifts of brain or speech always. One must have a peculiar fitness for the pulpit. Many one talent men seem to succeed whilst ten talent men depart without being desired. The kind of preachers the people want to hear are never unhappy in their work. Many are heard by "sufferance rather than with applause."

One main reason why ministers fail is a most unwelcome one, namely, that not all who are called are chosen. They are not chosen vessels on the people's part. This may be due to a number of causes:

They may not have the single eye. To live in the ministry one must have an eye single to the glory of God. A preacher being a man may have all the insidious, unconscious hungering after the flesh-pots of Egypt that other sinners have. He may have the world in his heart. One young farmer in my section went off to be a preacher. Next year he was back on the farm, and being twitted by his companions frankly said: "I found I could make more money farming than I could preaching!" It is a pitiful spectacle to see men in the holy office holding on desperately for a piece of bread. I feel deep compassion for those priests and nuns turned out of house and home in France recently, but a fact so consequential as unfitness for the office cannot be winked out of court.

One eminent national figure in the theological world used to have a laconic reply to all students who came to him in doubt about their call to the ministry. "What were you doing?" he would ask. "Farming," one would say. "Teaching school," came from another. The professor would say: "Well, go back to your farm or school, it will be all right with the Lord;" and he would wheel

round to his desk, leaving the poor fellow all befuddled, but the more he would think on the advice the more of a test it would be of his divine call.

The age demands men of high character, unimpeachable, "wearing the white flower of a blameless life." They must be like Cæsar's wife, "above suspicion." The age of rising ethics puts the most ethical man on top and wants to hear him speak. Any speck of mammon worship will rob him of the single eye. Any mistake or fall will dim his luster. Even domestic blunders, trifling business methods, will mark him off as not a pattern man. A man in the ministry who has married too young, contracted a heavy debt, or has too large a family to be reasonably supported in the ministry has blundered, in the eyes of the critical, and is that far short of a model man.

The age demands something more than correct character. It requires something heroic—men who are above political considerations, above greed, manly men who are time-servers never. I think people usually admire a minister who will not allow himself to be trampled upon, imposed upon. He has a right to demand fair treatment like any other workman, and will come nearer getting it if he does not wear an apologetic air.

The age demands also consecration to the work of the ministry. This cannot be worked up. One cannot force himself to love the work, but if he does not love men, it is safe to say, he had better stay out of the ministry. It takes this to give preaching the ring of genuineness. There are men holding on to the office whose preaching has lost the vital note. It is not the office suffering from decadence but they themselves. They do not hold and preach a virile gospel anymore. Many congregations have outgrown the minister, not only in culture but in consecration and faith.

The age demands a sympathetic, optimistic note. It is not an age of cocksureness about everything. It is rather an age unsettled about many things and yet anxious to hold the truth whilst it is weeding out the error.

It is a time when men feel a sort of despair in religion, a time of dejection, leading to recklessness. Men are needed who can throw splendid faith and optimism across the pathway of these weary pilgrims. He must, therefore, have strong faith himself without being dogmatic about everything. He must know his Book, and have a message from it adjusted to the age. It will not suffice to preach sermons borrowed from other men's gardens of the past, nor even defending too stoutly the traditions and cherished views of some of those who sit before him. He must think and speak with originality.

The age demands men of convictions, who stand for something definite in human life. There was never a finer field than now for social service and the churches are finding it out, only some not fast enough. No young man today must think of entering the ministry and trying to bolster up some decaying tradition or crumbling creed. He is doomed who does it. The pulpit may have once existed for itself, now it cannot be an end in itself. The church must not suppose that it can exist any longer as an end in itself but it must live for the community. It must be willing to lose its life that it may find it, sow itself down in the furrows of human need. There are therefore tremendous demands upon live, energetic men who wish to work for humanity.

There have been, and are, plenty of such men. Maybe it is well that too many are not rushing into the work at this time. We need fewer and better churches, and maybe fewer and better ministers. When my own poor ministry has waned it has been because of failure to come up to my own standards in my own life. When it has waxed, it has been from some spiritual victory won in my own character. This, I take it, is true of most.

There are many glorious compensations and the office is still one to be desired as good. People will hang upon their chosen ministry, support it, even flatter it.

During a dinner when the conversation turned upon the falling off in church attendance, the late Bishop Phil-

lips Brooks naively observed, "Why, wherever I go, there are crowds!" Such men as can come up to the standard of the age, men who have sat down and counted the cost, can always have people to hear them, and will not want for bread.

The world needs this kind of ministry and knows its need. So long as there are aching hearts, and weeping eyes, and death-beds, this kind of ministry will be more enduring than the purest Parian marble, and its office will be carved in what is more permanent than bronze, the deep love and gratitude of suffering men who have profited by it.

If the age has outgrown some things, as "churchanity," traditionalism, it has not outgrown the need of sympathy, and kindness, and salvation. The man who serves it acceptably must be a big man, above trifles, not listening to all words that are spoken, and always holding his office as a sacred trust.

Have not the world's workers really all had to do about this? Is the servant above his Lord? Is it any wonder when the ministry has grown so numerous that there should be few who can really measure up to the standard? But let us beware of allowing our self-made clouds to color all the horizon.

HEBREW, GREEK AND ROMAN.

PART II.

BY REV. S. ANGUS, M.A., PH.D.,

EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

The Hebrew mind was of as different an order from the Greek as the Semite from the Indo-European. Imagination held the place in the Semite that intellect held in the West. The Oriental mind was calm, contemplative, unquestioning, unmetaphysical, working in pictures and symbols, we might say concrete, or at least realistic. Sustained thought was impossible; the power of grouping a subject in all its complexities with subordination of the parts to the whole was not theirs. "They had no sense of organic unity."¹ I don't know a better *multum in parvo* description of the Hebrew mind than that given by Edward Caird. He says:²

"The Hebrew mind is intuitive, imaginative, almost incapable of analysis or of systematic connection of ideas. It does not hold its object clearly and steadily before it, or endeavor exactly to measure it; rather it may be said to give itself up to the influence of that which it contemplates, to identify itself with it, and to become possessed by it. Its perceptions of truth come to it in a series of vivid flashes of insight, which it is unable to co-ordinate. For the most part it expresses its thought symbolically, and it constantly confuses the symbol with the thing signified, or only corrects the deficiencies of one symbol by setting up another. In his native language, the Hebrew has only the scantiest means of expressing the dependence of one thought upon another or of building up a connected argument. If a complex object be por-

¹ Forsythe op. cit. p. 57.

² "The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers, Vol. II., pp. 188-9.

trayed by him, it is only in large and indefinite outlines and never as an ordered system of related parts. Hence he is almost incapable either of grasping prosaic fact in its bare simplicity, or of rising to a scientific consciousness of general laws; he lives rather in a consciousness of the unanalyzed whole, which presents itself now in one aspect and now in another, as when one stands before a scene which is illuminated from moment to moment by gleams of lightning.”

As might be expected such a genius would scarcely express itself in art—except perhaps in music and poetry. Their religion discouraged art:³ the second commandment sounded the death-knell of *plastic* art. When the Romans entered the shrine of the temple they were astonished to find no visible symbol of the Deity. The Hebrew was not gifted with the qualities that create art, with the power of keen observation, painstaking attention to details, the idealising faculty, the absorbing interest in nature, nor was he possessed with the love of earthly beauty. Moreover he did not enjoy the leisure necessary to cultivate art, his very national existence was precarious, and the Jews did not possess the retinue of slaves which enabled a Greek or Roman gentleman to devote himself to art. Besides, public opinion, so exacting and critical in Greece, was wanting to set the standard for artists and repudiate mediocrity. “The Hebrew had the soul but lacked the organ, the Indo-European had the organ but lacked the soul.”⁴ But though not artists themselves, “they have left (the world) that new creative life of the soul which makes art possible. They produced that which produced art.”⁵

The Hebrew lack of artistic genius was partly due to his natural environment. Nature presented itself in a stern way to the Hebrew. Barren hills, rocks, desert and

³ An interesting chapter on “Hebrew Art and Religion” will be found in Forsythe’s “Christ on Parnassus.”

⁴ *Ib.* p. 74.

⁵ *Ib.* p. 72.

untamed sea are not the best foster-mothers of art. His world was not so beautiful as the Greek world and suggested rather the Infinite, which lies beyond art (except perhaps music) and can only be faintly symbolized or hinted at. And the Hebrew view of nature was not conducive to art. The Greek began with nature and worked up to God. The Hebrew began with God—Creature, Mind and Nature were simply an act of the will of God. Nature was at best only an instrument in the Almighty's hand; it was not an image of God nor a garment of Deity. They had no fellow-feeling with nature and their souls could never be ravished with a sense of natural beauty, yet they could not and did not close their eyes to the fact that God made all things beautiful; this, however, was generally only a passing mood which raised the soul to God. Their interest was in the Creator rather than in the creature. They worshipped the King rather than His footstool. Beauty was not an end in itself for them. Pantheism had no attraction for the Hebrew mind. Nature was not God, but God used nature to His own purposes. They gloried in the sublime wilder aspects of His creation; they see God's might and His destructive power in nature. They have no fears of nature, like the Greek; all its phenomena are but God's symbols. The clouds are the chariots of Jahweh, the thunder is His voice, the lightning His darts, the hills rejoice and clap hands before Him, His voice breaketh in pieces the cedars of Lebanon and shaketh the wilderness, He scatters the eternal mountains. "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance?" "He taketh up the isles as a very little thing"; "He stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." "All things are thy servants." "And in his temple everything saith GLORY"⁶ (not Beauty only). Such

⁶ Ps. 19 (first part), Ps. 29, Hab. 3, Isaiah 40 may be regarded as characteristic.

colossal aspects of nature lie beyond the reach of representation in art. Thus the Hebrew was never fettered by nature, and never dwelt upon it, but soared above to its Author. He was a devout worshipper but could not be a great artist for "the imagination must be detained by Nature. It must lovingly dwell upon it, follow it, wait upon it, understand it for its own sake. Now that is just what the Hebrews did not and could not do."⁷ But "if Israel did not extract the sweetness of Nature's honey, she yet avoided the fate of the drunken bee which sips the popped syrup till in the charmed and fatal calyx it sinks, drowned. * * * The Greek idealized it [nature] and dwelt on it. The Hebrew spiritualized it and passed beyond it."⁸

Turning to Hebrew character let us note briefly its characteristic elements. First, one factor that added dignity to life was the Hebrew conception of his high calling. No people were ever so conscious of a God-appointed mission and place in history as the ancient Hebrews. This belief may have arisen—where many other noble religious conceptions first started—in a lower conception of God as a tribal limited deity, favoring his own people and hostile to all others. But if so, so much the more credit to the Jew. They believed they were a chosen elect people of Jahweh—*Thy* people Israel whom Thou hast redeemed, brought up by mighty signs from Egypt, fed miraculously in the wilderness and possessed them of the territory of their enemies. But gradually this selfish and conceited idea that God did all for them because He loved Jacob expanded till Israel believed God had chosen her for a purpose—to lead and bless and serve: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This blessing to the nations took on various forms—the missionary whereby Israel should bring all men to the knowledge of Jahweh and confess Him to be the only true God: "And many nations shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up

⁷ Forsythe 61.

⁸ *Ib.* 62.

to the mountain of Jehovah, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the Law and the Word of Jehovah from Jerusalem." In the book of *Tobit* and the *Sibylline Oracles* expression is given to the hope of the world's turning to God through the instrumentality of Israel. Or again the futuristic idea of a kingdom of righteousness to be set up by a scion of the house of David, or by a supernatural person waiting in heaven to undertake the task.⁹ In this kingdom Israel would occupy the premier place, but would be also the channels of blessings to others; or the idea of service by suffering so graphically depicted in the Second Isaiah. There the suffering servant of Jahweh—whether the individual Israelite or idealized Israel or the Messiah—is smitten of God, wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him and with his stripes we are healed. He bore our griefs and he carried our sorrows. And as the Hebrew believed he had a God-given mission he tried to be faithful in fulfilling it. Hence he became the earnest missionary of antiquity—all for the glory of his God.

Beside this there was a certain pervading mercenary spirit. It was an earlier stage of religion to which—as to childhood—a system of rewards and punishments was in vogue. But it was in harmony with the acute Hebrew sense of divine justice. The Hebrew never thought of the Stoic position that it is worth while living well whether any God takes notice or not. Before the Captivity¹⁰ the Israelite believed God would reward the righteous in this life with prosperity, length of days and numerous progeny and would punish the wicked by denying them the

⁹ Book of Enoch.

¹⁰ Of course this depends largely upon the date assigned to Job. If early it might be an aberrant production of a man ahead of his fellows as Aeschylus' "Prometheus Vincit" was ahead of his generation; and many thoughts in Sir Thomas Brown's "Religio Medici" appeared later in Hegelian philosophy, e. g. when he says "Omneity informed nullity into entity."

present rewards of the righteous. But thereafter he sought his reward in heaven. Righteousness tendeth to life and to rewards: "surely there is a reward to the righteous."

There is another element in Hebrew character which cannot escape notice: a puzzling dualism or strange contradiction in his nature—not an unknown quantity in our spiritual life of the twentieth century. In spite of the fact that the Jew was dominated by one masterful idea—the religious—and aspired to God, he is of the earth earthy, often manifesting a strange hankering after the baser and meaner. The Jew has always been astute—if he could succeed in serving both God and Mammon, so much the better. Stoicism and Neo-Platonism were alike foreign to his temperament. His sainthood never demanded renunciation of the world. He believed the world was created for him, and he pushed for his full share. His spiritual history, as he himself has written it in the Old Testament and later literature, is one of ebb and flow—sin, repentance, joy. He knew as well as we what it means to try to serve two masters and to sadly realize that other lords have had dominion over us. He knew what it was to behold the better and follow the worse; he was no stranger to the evils of a weak will. It was a Jew who said "when I would do good evil is present with me," and "the good that I would that I do not." Jacob is in many respects the characteristic Jew in whom the spiritual conflict is pronounced. This dualism is the more noticeable because the Jew had a conscience which was more sensitive than that of any other ancient people. The fifty-first psalm is typical Jewish repentance.

But with all this dualism of character—this joy and remorse—the Hebrew was a stranger to the worst perplexities and contradictions of life and to the pain of living. This does not mean that the Hebrew did not suffer, but there were multifold ills in life he was untouched by, or else he accepted them as a matter of course. Being only highly developed in one department of his nature—

the emotional—the floodgates of trouble for other channels were in mercy closed to him. The troubles he had were religious and not intellectual. He did not inquire so deeply into the human passions, motives, blindness, necessity, misery, which created the Greek drama as we know it in Aeschylus, Sophocles or Euripides. He did not understand the complexity of his own being nor the richness of his nature. By limiting his inquiries he simplified living. His intellect soon tired of hard thinking and he was content—unlike the Greek—to be a child of mystery and to allow things too deep or high for him to remain in the realm of the mysterious. He was not unaware of the volcanic forces dormant in his nature, but with a child's faith he let them rest. Hegel says: "It cannot at all be said that man's conflict within himself is something which did not exist among the Jewish people. On the contrary it constitutes an essential characteristic of the religious spirit amongst the Hebrews; but it was not conceived of in the speculative sense as implying that it arises from the nature of man himself, being represented rather as contingent, as taking place in single individuals."¹¹ The Hebrew experienced his anxiety but it was in regard to righteousness, for his Religion of Sublimity is characterized by "examination into and anxiety about what is wrong, the crying of the soul after God, this descent into the depths of the spirit, this yearning of the spirit after what is right, after what is in conformity with the will of God."¹²

Another phase of Hebrew character is its impressive solitariness—the loneliness of his life. He dwelt apart. The desert wastes and nomadic life left their mark. Neither society nor politics interested him. For him there were only two objects of absorbing interest in the universe—God and his own soul and the relation between these. "The two living realities, God and the Soul, are

¹¹ "Phil. of Relig.," English Translation, II. 194.

¹² *Ibid.*

face to face engaged in everlasting colloquy."¹³ He is alone so he may think aloud; in fact he can hardly think at all without giving utterance to his thought aloud or to himself. He maintains a constant dialogue either with himself or with God, for "thinking is to the Semite a speaking—questioning in the heart,"¹⁴ This solitariness pervades not only the inner spiritual life of the Israelite thereby making so much room for the thought of God, but also in his social life among his kith he is also solitary. And he was a stranger and alien among other peoples in the Dispersion and they were always strangers to him. He could not be amalgamated or fused into the surrounding society; he stood like a lonely rock in a stormy sea. This loneliness of character is all the more striking because the Jew developed a higher *social* consciousness than the nations around him. The nation, not the individual, was to him the unit, and all his institutions discouraged individualism. He was much more difficult to inoculate with individualism than the Greek, as it never was congenial to his nature. But his national consciousness was not organic; his nation was composed of isolated atoms.

Closely akin to this solitariness is the Hebrew sadness or seriousness (not pessimism, which was the form so usual to Greek sadness). All life was not sad, but the Hebrew generally contemplated the more serious side. His ideal was of course joy (not happiness), joy in resigning himself to the will of Jahweh. But his religion in which he sought joy was of a sombre and puritanic cast. Whatever might be said about the Jews, it could not be said that levity and carelessness were their characteristics, or that they were indifferent to moral issues. There was a strenuous earnestness in the race, so that Hebraism has been aptly enough incorporated into our language to

¹³ Butcher, "Harvard Lectures," p. 15.

¹⁴ Wellhausen, "Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien," p. 15; "denn auch das Denken ist dem Semiten ein Sprechen und Fragen im Herzen."

stand for the serious view of life as a discipline, the conception of true happiness lying along the line of duty and self-control and sacrifice.¹⁵ The Hebrews laughed, no doubt, and in the Talmud the doctors of the law break out into hearty laughter even in heaven, but their literature like their character is one-sided. Yet the literature a people preserves is what appeals to a people and in the Hebrew literature the Virgilian *rerum lacrymae* are present, but not the joyousness of living. "We have not the laughter as well as the tears of humanity."¹⁶ But the sadness of "this grimly earnest people" is rather seriousness than pessimism. Pessimism never laid hold on the tenacious Hebrew spirit; its almost unique occurrence in their literature—Ecclesiastes—is perhaps due to contagion from the later Greek spirit.

The Hebrew was never overwhelmed in sadness; he was always hopeful and patient. Hope has never lived so long in one people though no people has been overtaken by greater disasters. The lower their fortunes sank the brighter rose the star of hope. If the present generation was baffled then God must have something better in store for the future generations of His folk. Even to this day in the prayer at every celebration of the Passover occur the words "May it be next year in Jerusalem." At every circumcision an empty chair for Elijah is left. If the nation, as a nation, forgot God and was crushed, yet God would see that the righteous individual received his just reward either here or elsewhere. This aspect of individualism was pressed upon him to vindicate God's justice, but individualism as opposed to the national consciousness never thrived among the Hebrews. A Hebrew hardly wished to be saved alone. Moses was a true representative of his race when he prayed "if thou wilt forgive their sin—and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Ex. 32:32). Paul followed in the same line when his heart's desire and prayer to God

¹⁵ Black, "Culture and Restraint," ch. I., Zion against Greece.

¹⁶ Butcher, "Harvard Lectures," p. 14.

were that Israel as a nation might be saved, and still more in the words "I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ for my brethren's sake, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites" (Rom. 9:3, 4). If in this world there seemed no room for hope then the Jews projected their hopes into the future, not for the individual only, but for the race. On account of their tenacious social consciousness the idea of immortality was less necessary to the Hebrew than to the Egyptian or Babylonian; they anticipated our modern immortality of the race. And when after the captivity he came to need the comforts and strength of immortality his belief took the form of a Resurrection which was a social ideal as opposed to the Greek individualistic idea of immortality;¹⁷ "not the resurrection of the individual. It is the *resurrection* of a *dead people*. It is a *nation* once destroyed and dissolved now raised from its grave and reconstituted." This resurrection gave the Hebrew ground for faith that God would do right to all those of His people who had perished without seeing God's salvation. One belief obtained that at the resurrection all the Israelites of the Dispersion should have their bodies rolled along in subterranean caverns to the holy land to participate in the corporate joy of Israel.¹⁸

But the characteristic form of Hebrew life was what is termed the Messianic hope—the grandest optimism in the old world. "The Messianic hope of Israel has become the driving wheel of the whole civilized humanity."¹⁹ The Jews are remarkable not only for their peculiar form of optimism, but still more for the hold it took of their lives. They actually believed their hopes would be realized and

¹⁷ Cf. Salmond "Christian Doctrine of Immortality," p. 263 ff., and W. Adams Brown, "The Christian Hope," p. 65 ff. On individualism among the Jews, cf. Fairweather, "Background of the Gospels," p. 30 ff., and 273 ff. The rise and growth of individualistic ideas is treated in an interesting way in Charles: "Immortality, Hebrew, Jewish, Christian," p. 18, 54 ff., 100 f.

¹⁸ Kohler, *op. cit.* p. 293.

¹⁹ Kohler, p. 283 ("Die messianische Hoffnung Israels ist zum Triebkraft der gesamten zivilisierten Menschheit geworden").

the Kingdom of God would come. The Greek had his Utopias²⁰ or Ideal Republics, but he never expected earth to see them; they would never exist except in his imagination. But the faithful Israelite held "we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better," and the more he was baffled the more he hoped. "Though he slay me yet will I trust him." In order to save his faith in God he allowed God plenty of scope to work out His great purpose while the expectant servant patiently waited; no man was ever so patient with his God. When affairs on earth should become intolerable, God would intervene with catastrophic suddenness and send a deliverer to restore to Israel greater than the pristine glories and punish her oppressors. And some high Hebrew souls dreamed of the benefits of the Messianic era being extended to the nations but through the instrumentality of Israel. The Apocalypses and the New Testament testify amply to the vividness and reality of this hope. Even when Israel was being trampled under the heel of Rome she never ceased to look fervently for the Deliverer. If God delayed or disappointed their expectations they never thought He had forgotten them but allowed Him a longer term, attributing His delay to their own sinfulness. It was taught that if all Israel would keep the whole law perfectly for one day the Messiah would come. When other nations had lived through their halcyon days and were drifting to despair Israel held to her invincible optimism, looking for her halcyon days in God's future. Kohler²² informs us that present day Israel has practically abandoned the idea of a personal Messiah, laying emphasis rather on a Messianic *era* to come (the Kingdom of God) or transforming it to a belief that Israel after her suffering will prove a *Messiah-people* to the world.

As the Hebrew was egregiously a man of hope, he was also a man of patience. He waited patiently on the Lord

²⁰ This word was apparently coined by Sir Thomas More for his famous work.

²² Op. cit., p. 291.

despite all delays of providential succor. Sometimes his patience was sullen and defiant, sometimes it was the patience of resignation. He could wait because he had hope, his gaze being fixed on the Unseen: "If we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." Patience went hand in hand with his unflinching faith and his assurance that Jahweh not only heard but answered prayer. Only the fact that the Jewish people gave themselves wholly up to God's service explains "that remarkable steadfastness which was not a fanaticism of conversion like Mohammedanism * * * but a fanaticism of stubbornness."²³ Patience, innate to the Hebrew, was exercised and developed by his nomadic experiences, his non-gregarious pastoral life, precarious harvests, dreary expanses of howling wilderness, barren hills, harborless sea—surroundings in which there was little to distract or amuse, and all tended to thrust the spirit inward and then upward to God. It was exercised also by the uncertain tenure by which they held their land—the battleground of the ancient powers—and also by the distressing vicissitudes of their national life. If they were not to sink into despair and leave nothing but an empty name upon earth they must learn patience in their struggles. The Hebrew learned this hard lesson. He was patient in God, convinced that "the mills of God grind slowly." No people had apparently less reason to place unflinching faith in the goodness and love of God; they exemplify a great moral law, that difficulties and disappointments may be used to build character. They also believed that Jahweh dispensed both the good and the ills of life. Habakkuk's noble utterance may be cited as characteristic: "For though the fig-tree shall not flourish, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no food, the flock shall be cut off from the fold and there shall be no herd in the stalls: Yet I will rejoice in Jehovah, I will joy in the God of my

²³ Hegel "Phil. of Relig.," II. 212.

salvation." They could bear contumely and insults with dogged courage if not sometimes with indifference; they first tasted and then drank to the dregs the bitter cup of the *odium humani generis*, requiting hate with hate and scorn with scorn.

The Jew suffered for humanity. He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. The suffering friendless servant of Jehovah of Deutero-Isaiah may fittingly be applied to spiritual Israel. The Jews command the admiration and gratitude of all men as the best interpreters of human suffering; in this respect they achieved much in preparation for the gospel of suffering, self-sacrificing Love. It is true that a suffering defeated Messiah was averse to Jewish thinking; they had tasted the suffering and longed to taste the glory. But suffering with its mission and blessings was theirs.²⁴ God found in the Jews a people able to bear the irksome yoke of sorrow in such a way as to convince mankind that sorrow has not a negative but a positive value in human character and human destiny, that its mission is not to crush man into despair nor drive him to rebellion, but to act as it were a solvent to unloose all the diviner elements of his nature, detach him from the things of sense to appreciate the things of the spirit and to see the beauty of the Lord his God. The Jew did not suffer for naught; he discovered where to go to find consolation, comfort and renewed strength. In joy and prosperity we are Greeks, but in our disappointments and suffering we convert to Jews in order to share in Jewish consolations. One reason why the Jew suffered so uncomplainingly and profitably was the fact that he attributed his sufferings to no blind Fate or inexorable Nemesis or to a capricious god whose morals were below his own, but to a personal and moral God. And the reason was that he was convinced that he deserved his suffering as a punishment for his sins. And so, whatever appalling calamities might overtake him, he survived as

²⁴ For a Jew on the sufferings of Israel, cf. Kohler op. cit. p. 274 f.

a potent factor among humanity. From every defeat he reaped some spiritual victory. After the long struggles to gain foothold in their appointed land, to maintain themselves amid hostile and powerful enemies, the disruption of this kingdom, prolonged civil war, exile, humiliation under the Greek dominion and the destruction of their *nation* and Holy City by the Romans, they are yet an unspent force. No more fitting symbol of this unconquered and unconquerable people could be found than that of the burning bush "burning yet not consumed"—*ardens sed virens*. Seneca²⁸ says of the Jews *victi victoribus leges dederunt*. So the Jew is a persistent type. He may have fallen from his own lofty ideals, he may have forgotten part of his spiritual message to us, but he has been and shall ever be

"In freta dum fluvii current, dum montibus umbrae

Lustrabunt convexa, polus dum sidera pascet,"

and he has well merited his position. His battle cry has been and still is "No surrender." The Hebrew could never confess his work and glory to be over in anything like the Vergilian words,

"Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens Gloria Teucrum."

A recent writer in the *EXPOSITOR*²⁵ in an article on "The Unconsumed People," cited a motto seen on a Jewish carriage, "fuimus-erimus" (we have been, we shall continue to be)—truly appropriate for the Jew.

Another factor in this unconquerable hope and patience under suffering must not be overlooked—the Hebrew way of viewing things *sub specie aeternitatis*²⁶—the everlasting and infinite in his character. Israel endured as seeing Him who is invisible. We may aptly apply to the spirit of Israel the words of Ecclesiastes 3: "He hath set *eternity* (Olam) in their hearts."²⁷ The Jew felt

²⁸ Cited in Augustine "De Civitate Dei," VI. 11.

²⁵ A. R. Simpson, Aug., 1912.

²⁶ Words, I believe, first coined by a Jew—Spinoza, in the second book of his "Ethics."

²⁷ Delitzsch and Amer. R. V. The A. V. and English R. V. give more prosaically "the world."

he was only a pilgrim and a stranger on earth, his true home being with God. Hanker as he constantly did after material prosperity and the delights of sense, his ideal was the joy of the Lord. He was a stranger to the Greek satisfaction with the finite; no man in antiquity so yearned after the Infinite and manifested such a "zeal for God." The Hebrew world was less beautiful and interesting than the Greek world. It did not fetter the thoughts to the finite, but rather raised them to the infinite. I have read somewhere an epigram applied to Syria, but which is still more applicable to Palestine: "Its epidemics—everlastingness." As Forsythe²⁹ has remarked, the Greek could enjoy the daylight and the sunshine "but the Semite must live in the shade during the day. It was at night he came out to enjoy the beauty of the world. But the beauty of night is the beauty of the Infinite. Earthly things lose both color and form. The things of heaven grow more deep and clear. Thought is repelled from earth and cast to the sky." But the Hebrew did not pause with the vast colossal Infinite and unknowable Absolute. He pressed on to find in the Infinite a Personal God.³⁰ In the Eastern night the myriads of stars, vastness of heaven, and pale, dim outline of earth gave birth to the Infinite, but an Infinite Creator. The voices of earth were hushed but those of heaven and God were heard. The Hebrew launched out into the unseen with a mystic sense that he belonged rather there than to his present finite environment. His soul yearned to be with the Unseen which was no abstraction but a power in his life. He cultivated the spiritual faculty of hearing the voice of God in the earthquake, tempest or the still small voice.

As the Hebrew without any system of ethics lived on the whole a moral life, so also without any system or philosophy of history he excelled all other peoples of an-

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

³⁰ Though Herbert Spencer and others will say that Personality is limitation, definition, and cannot be Infinite or applied to the Infinite.

tiquity and probably of modern times in being able to read the lessons taught by his history. Like the Christian he harbored no doubts as to the moral government of the universe by God whether he could understand God's ways or not. *His judgments must be righteous.* And to the Hebrew his God was not the God of Nature but of History. Nature was merely the stage on which God enacted His great drama and unfolded His purpose. The Hebrew believed in God's Revelation of Himself in history. "It is the influence of the Hebrew faith that has kept alive the ideal of development and purposes, the standard of domestic and national life; *for the deities of the Greeks are Natural Divinities, but the Jehovah of the Hebrews is the God of History.*"³¹ Poetry being the natural expression of his thoughts the Hebrew could not even write history and had no conception of what Thucydides or Livy would have called history. His way of attempting to write history was to string in a monotonous fashion the facts around the person of a judge or king using these personages as chronological landmarks. It was only *annals* he wrote and mostly dull at that compared, say, with the *Annals* of Tacitus. His method of writing history tempted numerous Redactors in antiquity and has supplied work and amusement to innumerable Critics in modern times. There was no central idea, no whole to which each of the parts contributed, no sense of organic unity. The aggregate was composed of episodes more or less disconnected, no movement and little dramatic force. This does not mean that dramatic situations or episodes are not to be found. The dramatic element is there, but it is spasmodic or episodic; the Hebrew could not write a drama but he was quite alive to *dramatic* situations. The story of Jephthah is highly dramatic. His vow to be executed upon his return to his house "in peace" after victory over the children of Ammon, seems to tell us of the blindness and audacity of man; we almost think of the Aeschyl-

³¹ Bussell, "The School of Plato," p. 195. (The italics are the author's.)

lean ἰβρις. A happy, victorious father came to his house. Then with the heightened situation—met by his daughter, “his only child; besides her he had neither son nor daughter.” She came in his hour of joy to rejoice with him “with timbrels and with dances.” The tragic situation is complete. The dramatic incidents in the story of Samson and Delilah have appealed to all ages. But, generally speaking, the conception of the Aeschylean drama was as far above the Hebrew as the Thucydidean conception of history. This was in keeping with the Hebrew lack of system, absence of organic sense, inability to grasp a whole subject in all its complexity with the interaction of the details. But he was alive to moral themes in history and was at least equally, if not more, interested in God’s doings in history than man’s. And so history had a truer significance for the Hebrews than for other people;³² they read lessons of God’s judgment. They discovered the truth of the maxim “history is philosophy teaching by example,” in which for *philosophy* the Jews would substitute *God*. They found in their annals confirmation for their inspiring belief in a covenant relation between themselves and Jahweh, which when violated by man could not be observed by a just God. They seem to have had a keener sense of divine justice than of human. History spelled for them in large letters God’s justice and His zeal for righteousness.

Judaism worked diligently and successfully to prepare the ancient world for the elder of her daughter religions—Christianity. Her lofty spiritual monotheism, her ethical religion, her unceasing prayers, her ardent longing for God’s Revelation, her Bible, her burning Messianic hopes, her unswerving faith in a Redemption and the certainty of the kingdom of God upon earth, her religious lyrics, her own conduct under suffering, her missionary propaganda—in these and other ways she prepared the way of the Lord. True, her faith in the coming

³² Butcher, “Harvard Lectures,” p. 29 f.

of a Messiah was greater than her ability to recognize the "Coming One." But it was Judaism that fostered that fine piety in which Jesus spent His boyhood or in which Jesus was possible, it was to her prophets He went for inspiration and it was her methods of thought He employed.

It may be interesting to glance at the Jew when he became Christian. Already Judaism had commenced to worship its past and make its law a burden and hindrance against progress. It was at this period the Jew began to adopt the new faith. But he—like the Greek and Roman and Western barbarian—brought his past for good and evil with him into Christianity. He did not want Christianity, but a reformed Judaism, or tried to engraft Christianity upon the old stock of Judaism. He brought his Bible with him and with it a very liberal interpretation. It was not his Bible that hampered him, but the minutiae of scribism. So the Jew had a tendency to be conservative and formal, blending old and new, and often failing to grasp the spirit in the worship of the letter. Old texts appealed to him with sentimental force and as rules for daily guidance. He was also exclusive, still believing that he should occupy the chief place in the kingdom of heaven. On the other hand there was a liberal party. As a matter of fact there always has been and still is a cleft in Judaism.³³ There was always a narrow patriotic conservative party, chained to the past and compelled to do only as the fathers had done; on the other hand a party for expansion and believers in a forward movement. The disaster of 70 A. D. drove the Jews into one or other of these extreme camps. They either clung to Judaism and repudiated Christianity, or adopted Christianity as the final fulfilment of their long expectations. But even previous to this calamity there were liberal spirits. So far as we can see, had it not been for a

³³ Abrahams and Montefiore, "Aspects of Judaism," 1895, and Kohler, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

Jew, Paul of Tarsus, Christianity must have remained merely a Jewish sect and never entered upon its mission "to all the nations." The rather bigoted policy of James and the ascendancy of the Jerusalem church would have greatly hampered it. Next to Jesus, Paul is the grandest and largest spirit of Judaism.

There were some things hidden from the Hebrew. He never fathomed the richness and deeps of our manifold nature. But he did discover that man is made for the infinite, that man cannot live by bread alone, that the hunger of the soul can never be satisfied except in God, that God is a moral and spiritual Being zealous for righteousness in man, a Person with whom our finite spirit may hold converse. He was conscious of his own weakness and littleness and of his urgent need of prayer. He was the first who became alive to the sense of sin and the need of reconciliation. And to him God was the only Unity, the One, who as moral Governor of all, impressed His laws on man's heart so that man must be moral if religious. "And as long as the world lasts all who want to make progress in righteousness will come to Israel for inspiration as to the people who have had the sense for righteousness most glowing and strongest, and in hearing and reading the words Israel has uttered for us, carers for conduct will find a glow and a force they could find nowhere else. As well imagine a man with a sense for sculpture not cultivating it by the help of the remains of Greek art or a man with a sense for poetry not cultivating it by the help of Homer and Shakespeare, as a man with a sense for conduct not cultivating it by the help of the Bible." "Greece was the lifter up to the nations of the banner of art and science, as Israel was the lifter up of the banner of righteousness, and this brilliant Greece perished for lack of attention enough to *conduct*, for want of conduct, steadiness, character. And there is the difference between Greece and Judæa; both were custodians of a Revelation and both perished; but Grece perished of *over-fidelity* to her revelation and Judæa per-

ished of *under-fidelity* to hers. Nay, and the victorious Revelation now, even now in this age, when more of beauty and more of knowledge are so much needed—and knowledge at any rate is so highly esteemed, the Revelation which rules the world even now is not Greece's Revelation, but Judæa's—not the pre-eminence of art and science but the pre-eminence of righteousness." These are remarkable words for a man who—since the days of Goethe—was the truest reflection of the Greek spirit in everything he did and said.³⁴

Such are, in bare outline, some of the characteristics of, and some of the services rendered mankind by, a race in which all the nations of the earth have been blessed, a race which has given us an Isaiah, a Jeremiah, a Moses, a Hosea, a John the Baptist and a Paul, and whose greatest gift and service to humanity is One who came not to destroy but to *fulfill* the highest hopes and aspirations of Israel.

³⁴ Matthew Arnold: "Literature and Dogma," Ch. I. 5 and XI. 5.

THE GENESIS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

BY A. J. DICKINSON, D.D., BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

“The textual phenomena of 16:25-27 (apart from any question of their authorship) are sufficient by themselves to start the further problem, whether the canonical form of Romans does not represent a process of more or less extensive editing. The insertion of Rom. 16:1-23 proves that the epistle as it stands did not come from Paul and his amanuensis at Corinth, but we cannot even be sure that 1-15 is equivalent to the original letter. It is plain that when the Romans came to be incorporated in the Pauline canon, editorial changes were made either then or (perhaps also) at subsequent periods. The question is, whether such internal phenomena as can be noted (partly from the textual condition of the epistle) were due to Paul himself or to a later hand.” Thus writes Moffat in his Introduction, p 139. The problems which are here disturbing him have for several years disturbed my own mind; and I beg to lay before the reader some suggestions which have occurred to me by way of helping to a more definite and satisfactory view of the situation than that above given.

That Romans is the resultant of a long process of varied literary effort seems to be necessary to explain the phenomena here had in mind. But that that process took place under the immediate supervision and direction of the Apostle Paul, and the present canonical form was given it by him, is also demanded by these same facts. Like the Corinthian Epistles (see Review and Expositor, Oct. 1911 p. 567 ff.) Romans also is epistolized by the Apostle from his previous writings, and at that time was given its present canonical character and competency. These previous primitive writings may be to some extent discovered through a critical study of the historical and literary phenomena of the Epistle as we have it and in its

textual history as shown by existing variants. With a view to discovering these sources and recovering the historical genesis of the Epistle I have made some study of the facts involved and these investigations seem to warrant the following analysis into sources and genetic process for the Epistle in its canonical form.

(1) Paul wrote a letter to the church at Rome from Corinth in 56 A. D., in which he promises them a visit on his way to Spain after he has taken to Jerusalem the contribution for the poor saints; and on this last dangerous mission he asks their prayers, 1:1a, 7 a, c, 8-15; 15:22-33.

(2) He wrote another letter from Nicopolis or Corinth in 64 A. D., after his release from his first imprisonment in Rome, 15:14-21; 16:1-23. This letter was intended to accompany a pastoral note, 15:1-13, which he refers to by way of apology in 15:15 as follows: "But I wrote the more boldly unto you in some measure, as putting you again in remembrance, because of the grace that was given me of God," etc. Here the aorist tense "wrote" is not the epistolary aorist at all, but is the ordinary use of the aorist for a single action in the past, and refers to the pastoral he had just written (and possibly sent by another letter carrier) as indicated above. The comparison in "more boldly in some measure" is a reference to this pastoral as related to a yet more previous pastoral; to which the last words "as putting you *again* in remembrance" must also refer, and shows that the two pastorals had to do with the same subject. Now, if we find the first pastoral in 15:1-13 as above suggested, the second one will be found in chapter 14, where the same subject is treated less boldly. It seems to me that this verse requires at least three writings to fully satisfy its references. If this letter be dated as suggested above in 64 it will explain the inclusion of Illyricum in the province in which the Apostle has "fully preached the gospel" as a pioneer missionary, 15:19, which was the case at that time but probably was not in 57 when he wrote the letter first indicated. It will also explain how he comes to know so

many members of the church at Rome so intimately and had received from them so many personal services referred to in 16:1-16; for he had spent more than two years with them during his first imprisonment "receiving all that went in unto him." It will also explain his first-hand knowledge of the schismatics in 16:17-20, who may well be the more extreme wing of the "Strong" referred to in the pastorals mentioned; and "the doctrine which ye learned" may well refer to the teachings in those writings. I am unable to account for these references with any other date for the letter.

Besides the two letters above indicated there is left to be accounted for the great body of the Epistle; and here it will be noted that the literary features and style have none of the marks of a letter, but are at every point tinged with the characteristics of discourse and homily. I am unable to discover in this part of the Epistle any symptom of their ever having been letters, but everywhere they have the savor of the homiletic and discursive. We may not, therefore, look for letters as the primitive sources of this section, but written homilies and briefs. The American Revisers have divided this portion of the Epistle into the following sections by breaks in the text, 1:16-8:39; 9-11; 12-13;14; and we may add 15:1-13. But the more I study 1:16-8:39 with a view to discovering whether it is composite or not, the more I am convinced that it is, in a way. With many misgivings I venture to suggest the following analysis of it into its primitive sources.

(1) A homily, or homiletical brief, expounding the messianic righteousness, justification by faith, of the Kingdom of God, specially addressed to Jews, 1:18 to 3:22a (2:9-15, 3:3-8 being interpolations), 3:27-4:25. Here he argues from the point of view of the Jew not yet become a Christian, and pleads with them in behalf of Jesus as the Messiah from the Old Testament Scriptures. It would be difficult to find a more fitting setting for this preaching than that given in Acts 28:23, where for a

whole day "he expounded, testifying the Kingdom of God, and persuading them concerning Jesus, both from the law of Moses and from the prophets" to a great assembly of Jews, who had met to hear him by appointment.

(2) A homily expounding the messianic righteousness from the platform and view-point of humanity, Jew and Gentile alike, as a gospel for the Roman world without distinction of persons, 1:16-17, 3:22b-26, 5-6. Here the use of the pronoun of the first person plural shows that the author is speaking for and in behalf of men, Jew and Gentile alike, as distinctly as in the homily above he is arguing with and for Jews alone. We may find a fitting setting for it in the purpose which he announced in Acts 28:28 "Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles; they will also hear."

(3) A homily to Jewish-Christians, the first-fruits of Zion Redeemed as presented in Isaiah 40-66 and other prophets, as they are related to the Kingdom of God and its righteousness brought in through Jesus, 7-8. Here the Apostle has caught the note of the prophetic rhapsody, and exults in the glorious prerogatives of the messianic remnant in bringing in the Kingdom of God. He is here speaking from the platform of Christian Jews, and the language takes on definite and concrete meaning when viewed in this light. Its purpose is to hold converts from the Jews to their messianic hope and mission. It is probably gleaned from the preaching he would have given to those Jews who believed after the preaching in Acts 28:23 ff., to hold them to the church as against their unbelieving brethren. We may therefore date it soon after the two above defined. It will be noted that all three of these homilies deal with the same subject, but from different points of view; that all three of them are intensely homiletical and argumentative; that they fit well into the situation which marked the beginning of his ministry at Rome. It is not necessary to hold that they ever existed in written form as separate homilies; for to posit oral preaching of definite form is sufficient to account for all

the facts as we have them. Yet if the church at Rome consisted of several house-churches, wherein the members met according to their social and racial differences or the location of their homes, it would be natural for the homilies to have been written to these groups; and especially the last one to have been written to be read in the Jewish house-church. These homilies, treating the same subject, drawn from the preaching of about the same time, dealing with burning issues in the life of the church, would very soon be in demand in written form; and so the Apostle would put them together for publication and circulation, as well as for public reading in the several house-churches. Hence they got into the form we now have them in 1:16-8:39 very early; and if regard is had only to written sources, we may consider them as one.

(4) The homily, 9-11, is written to meet the demands of a situation. There is already a distinction between believing Jews and unbelieving ones, the former having accepted the messianic righteousness of God and the latter having rejected the Kingdom and its righteousness. So pronounced is their rejection, that it implies that they too are rejected of God; and how that could be is a burning issue among the Jewish Christians, which the Apostle feels it his duty to expound. The election of the Gentiles is now also a potent fact, and is treated as a part and parcel of the problem concerning the rejection of the Jews; and the homily is addressed to both constituents in the church, but in full recognition of the distinction between Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian, 9:24; 11:13, etc. This situation is but one step removed from that in the homilies above and in the passage at the close of Acts.

(5) In 12-13 we have a piece of Christian Wisdom writing on how to live the Christian life in the Roman Empire, and especially at Rome. The situation to which it is addressed comes out in tendencies to incipient schism, threatening persecutions, disposition to resist the police, and danger of disregarding civic obligations. Undoubtedly the fires which are destined to burst out in the perse-

cution of Nero are being kindled. The situation is yet more highly developed than that indicated in the homily 9-11; and so we may date this after that.

(6) The two pastoral homilies, 14 and 15:1-13, deal with the question of how, though widely separated in scruples, Jewish and Gentile Christians may live together in the culture of the messianic life in mutual peace and helpful service. Whether they are to be regarded as one writing, or two, is much in dispute; but it seems to me that textual facts and the patent double reference in 15:15 considered above show the two to have originally been separate writings. The textual facts referred to concern the existence of a very old edition of the Epistle, which ended with chapter 14 without including 15:1-13, which will be discussed below. The position which seems to me to explain all the facts is that 14 was a pastoral homily written by the Apostle just after those above; and 15:1-13 another written after his release just before he wrote the second letter above indicated, and so chapter 14 got into the earlier edition of the Epistle and 15:1-13 did not.

(7) Besides the letters and homilies above indicated we have a conflated introduction, 1:1-7 and an authenticating doxology, 16:25-27, which he wrote when the sources were put into their present canonical form. The important textual phenomena bearing on our problems are given with sufficient detail in Sanday's Commentary, p. lxxxix, and in Zahn's Introduction, vol. I 22; but they may be briefly summarized for our purposes as follows: (1) The words "in Rome" are wanting in some old and respectable texts in 1:7, 15. (2) The doxology is given in the great majority of texts at 16:25-27, as in our Bibles; but many good texts give it after 14:23; some give it at both places; some omit it entirely. Marcion, Irenæus, Tertullian and Cyprian seem to have had a text which ended at 14:23 with the doxology. (3) The Codices Amiatinus and Fuldensis of the Vulgate preserve two very old tables of contents made very early for the Epistle, one, Amiatinus, with 51 sections, ending at 14:23 with the doxology,

the other Fuldensis, with 23 sections, covers the Epistle to 14:23, and then beginning again at 9:1 with section 24 covers 9:14 again with 28 sections. These phenomena seem to evidence several editions of the Epistle from the very first, one covering 1:1-6, 16-8:39, another covering 1:1-6, 16-14:23, and a third giving the Epistle as we have it.

The theory of the process by which the Epistle took its canonical form, which I wish to suggest, is as follows: In the year 57 A. D. the Apostle wrote to the church at Rome the first letter enumerated above. After his arrival in Rome, and during the first year of his imprisonment he wrote the homilies 1:1-6, 16-8:39, and it was published and got into circulation as the first edition. After he had published his first edition he wrote the homilies 9-11, 12-13 and 14; and about the time of his release these together with those in the first edition were published and put into circulation as a second and enlarged edition of his homilies. During the period between the two imprisonments he wrote the pastoral in 15:1-13 and the letter accompanying it, 15:14-21, 16:1-23; and during his second imprisonment a third edition of his writings was issued including the homilies in the previous ones, this pastoral note and the two letters. This was the time he epistolized the sources into their present form for the purpose of serving as Christian Scripture in the culture of the messianic life in the churches; and he authenticated the second edition containing the homilies only, and the third containing also the letters, with the doxology, and hence it occurs at both 14:23 where the edition of the homilies ended and at 16:25-27 where the last and final edition ends. Was it with a view to this work, while in prison at Rome the second time waiting for his execution, that he wrote Timothy to bring him the papyrus books and parchments left in his coat pockets at Troas, II Tim.4:13? So the process through which the Romans came to assume its present canonical form extended over the years 57-65 A. D., and involved varied and complex literary efforts;

but it was all done under the Apostle's supervision and finally received his authentication. So I hold that it is both unnecessary and contrary to the facts as we have them to suppose that any other hand than that of Paul himself contributed to the process implied in the genetic history of Romans. The content of Romans was first life and then literature; nor has the life been extinguished in transforming the original sources into literature. Nor does the canonical competency of the writing depend on its being epistolized into literature entirely; but its sources carried the same force and performed the same function among its first readers. Accurate exegesis of the literary resultant must depend to some extent on the recovery of the genetic process through which the Epistle reached its canonical maturity; and so we must not lightly set aside the task involved in this discussion, if we would gain full benefit the Epistle was intended to convey.

EXPOSITORY NOTES.

BY W. O. CARVER.

PHIL. 3:10; cf. JOHN 17:11-12; MT. 1:21.

“The Name that is above every name.”

In this paragraph in Philippians, Paul is urging humble self-surrender in the service of others, and presents Jesus as the ideal example of this virtue. Having pointed out in verses 6-9 how “Christ Jesus” regarded Himself, and the depths to which He went in serving, Paul turns to show how God honored this course in His Anointed. He gave Him the name—not a name, as in the Authorized Version—the name that is above every name. This does not mean that subsequent to His resurrection and ascension God gave Jesus the supreme position of glory in the admiring gaze of the universe. It means that the name Jesus, assigned to Him before His birth, is the greatest name that can be conceived, and that it expresses the true character of Jesus as Saviour. That is, of course, the meaning of the word. It was in this saviourhood that Jesus had guarded His followers. In this character He prays the Father still to guard them. This saviour character is that before which men bow everywhere and always when they come to see its meaning. Jesus wins the honor of the human heart and the glory of eternity by His saviourhood. Thus Jesus is the supreme name.

HEB. 13:20.

“Great in the blood of the everlasting covenant.”

Perhaps the most profound and impressive of all the Apostolic “benedictions” is that of Hebrews. Its stately grandeur and comprehensive reach have made it especially popular with Presbyterians. It seems to me to carry

one item of emphasis and theological significance that is obscured in our translations, and quite generally overlooked. All benedictions and other oft-used passages take on a sort of fixed meaning and are peculiarly difficult to modify in the way of enlarging or correcting their import.

In the Greek the order does not read, as in English, "who brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep with the blood of an eternal covenant." The order is ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου.

It would seem obvious that the author means to affirm that the greatness of the Shepherd lies in the blood of the eternal covenant. We may preserve the emphasis by reading: The Shepherd of the sheep who is great by reason of the blood of the covenant of eternity.

JOHN 1:1-16.

The Order of the Manifestation of the Logos.

It seems to be generally accepted that verses 9-13 of the Prologue to John's Gospel refer to the coming of Jesus Christ to the Jews, and to their rejection of Him. This note is intended, tentatively only, to suggest another interpretation. By comparing verses 6-8 with verse 15, it will appear that 9-14 constitute a sort of parenthesis, explanatory of John's function and message. This explanation, however, must connect itself directly with verses 1-5 as an account of the progressive work of the Logos.

The cosmic function and essential relation of the Logos appear in 1-3. Verses 4-5 present the life-giving, light-giving function and relation of the Logos to the human race. This is all pre-incarnate and apart from any necessary connection with the idea of incarnation.

At verse 6, John is about to introduce the historical Christ Jesus through the Witness, John. But a further ex-

BOOK REVIEWS

I.—PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

Moral Training in School and Home. By Sneath and Hodges. The Macmillan Co., 1913. 80c, net.

The authors of this timely volume are men of experience and insight into the problems of moral training in school and home. They have therefore produced a book which is a suggestive guide to parents, teachers, and other leaders in the molding of character. The various phases of human development are discussed, namely, bodily life, the social life as developed in the home, the school, and the community; the economic life, the political life, and the aesthetic life. One need not accept the authors' ideas as to the moral benefits of the dance to children and yet be greatly profited by the general discussion. Perhaps the last two chapters are the most suggestive ones, as they present methods for creating a moral atmosphere in the school and for the correlation of religion and moral training. The outlines of the various topics are clear and comprehensive, and the school grade in which the sub-topics are to be taught is indicated. Perhaps the most helpful feature of the book is the excellent bibliography appended to each chapter. In these bibliographies we find a rich and varied selection of literature adapted to the progressive stages of the child's unfolding life.

B. H. DEMENT.

Sunday-School Experience. By H. E. Tralle, M.A., Th.D., Professor of Religious Pedagogy, Hardin College, Mexico, Mo. Hardin College Press, Mexico, Mo. 1913.

Dr. Tralle has brought to the production of this volume a rare pedagogical aptitude, a ripe scholarship and rich experience in Sunday-school work. Sunday-school teachers are therefore

under many obligations to him for the sane, suggestive, pointed, and practical treatment of the most vital themes connected with their life and labors. In fifty chapters he discusses the four great departments of the Sunday-school enterprise. The first ten chapters deal with the *teacher*, the second ten with the *pupil*, the third ten with the *school*, and the last twenty with the *Bible*. The book is a first standard teacher-training course, and its completion entitles one to a diploma from any State Sunday-school Association. The author bases his discussion on the fundamental principles of modern psychology, intelligent observation and extensive experience. The material of each chapter is logically arranged and pedagogically treated. At the close of each chapter appropriate questions and topics are arranged under the title of *writings and discussions*, while several well selected references to valuable treatises are given under *What others say*. The volume is simple, strong, and up-to-date.

B. H. DEMENT.

One Hundred Chapel-Talks to Theological Students, Together with Two Autobiographical Addresses. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, President Emeritus of the Rochester Theological Seminary. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. \$1.20.

For forty years Dr. Strong was president of Rochester Theological Seminary, and during practically all of this time he conducted a brief noon prayer-meeting in the school of the prophets. During the last year of his presidency his informal daily talks at the devotional hour were stenographically taken down without his knowledge. These messages have therefore all the simplicity, directness and fervor of heart-to-heart talks on topics of practical interest and everyday needs. A variety of subjects is dealt with in a suggestive and illuminating manner, and many biographical and scientific illustrations give point and power to the discussions which are usually two or three pages in length. The first of the two autobiographical addresses is on Theology and Experience and is of unusual interest as indicative of the evolution and formulation of theological belief from progressive crises in Christian experience. The second ad-

dress on Self-Limitation was delivered at a banquet given in his honor upon his retirement from the presidency of the Rochester Theological Seminary.

B. H. DEMENT.

The Old Testament in the Sunday-School. By A. J. W. Myers, B.D., Ph.D. Published by Teachers' College, Columbia University, New York City, 1912. 136 pages.

The first sentence of the introduction indicates the purpose and scope of this scholarly little volume. The author says, "The primary purpose of this essay is to examine the adaptability of the Old Testament as material for the Sunday-school curriculum, according to the principles (1) of education, (2) of biblical criticism, and (3) of the Christian conception of life and society." After a succinct statement of the educational and religious pre-suppositions underlying the discussion, the main body of the work is presented in three Parts. In Part I. the author considers the difficulties involved in the use of the Old Testament for Christian instruction. Special attention is paid to the difficulties growing out of the history of Israel's religion, and those involved in the history of Israel's literature. In stating some of the results of ignoring these difficulties, Dr. Myers brings the International Uniform Lessons and the Lutheran Graded System under sharp review. Part II. gives an educational classification of the Old Testament material according to its adaptation to the different departments of Sunday school organization; namely, Primary Department, Junior Department, Intermediate Department, Senior and Adult Department. In this portion of the discussion the author has made a valuable contribution to Sunday-school Pedagogy in its relation to the selection and correlation of Biblical material best adapted to the development of Christian character. The tables which clearly indicate the Old Testament material best suited to each department of the Sunday-school are prepared with great care, and are suggestive and helpful to those who wish to teach the Word of God most effectively. The principles of selection and their application to particular passages quicken thought, even when they do not secure

acquiescence. Part III. is devoted to a consideration of graded curricula which approach the results contemplated by the author. The Constructive Bible Studies, the New York Sunday-school Commission Lessons, the International Graded Sunday-school lessons, and the Bible Study Union lessons are critically examined in the light of the author's principles of selection and adaptation of material. The existence of various documents in the present structure of the Old Testament is assumed throughout, and this results in a radical reconstruction of the Biblical presentation of the history of Israel. The author considers the Tabernacle an "ideal creation of the exilic priesthood, eight hundred years after Moses." He wends his way with skill through the documentary wilderness, utilizing the material of J, E, D and P, according to the school of Biblical Criticism with which he is affiliated.

B. H. DEMENT.

Questions Asked by Young Men. Five Sermons by Newton H. Marshall, M.A., Ph.D. James Clarke & Co., London, 1912. 70 pages. Price 3d.

Dr. Marshall preached these sermons in Heath Street Chapel, Hampstead. The "questions" are: "Why Are We Here?" "Why Does God Permit Pain?" "What Difference Does It Make to Be a Christian?" "Why All These Sects and Not One Church?" "How Can We Find God for Ourselves?" These are real, not hypothetical questions and Dr. Marshall has answered them with great pith and point. He is thoroughly loyal to Christ and understands the heart-hunger of young men of today for Jesus. The note of reality runs all through these sermons. They will do good wherever read, for they grip the conscience.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Dry Dock of a Thousand Wrecks. By Philip I. Roberts; with an Introduction by John Henry Jowett, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, 1912. 212 pages. \$1.00 net.

The Water Street Mission—the McAuley Mission—famous wherever men take intelligent interest in the redeeming power of the Gospel—has a new, larger, better adapted home. Mr. Roberts uses the occasion to give a fresh statement of the principles and methods of this mission and, chiefly, to bring forward a group of testimonies of men now living in New York who were redeemed from wretched drunkenness and all sorts of sin through the agency of this mission. The work is splendidly done. In the main the men are allowed to give their experiences in their own words. This work is a continuation of the story so well told by Mr. Hadley in "Down in Water Street." Every few years provide a bulk of new material for the story of redemption in such work and there is a never-failing interest in the story.

W. O. CARVER.

Chel: A Story of the Swiss Mountains. By Johanna Spyri. Eaton & Mains. New York. 75 cents.

A very charming story of life in a rude, uncultured Swiss village which was transformed in a remarkable way by a minister's daughter who took charge of the school when no one else could be found to do so. In a very tactful manner, and all unwittingly apparently, she applies the principles of Pedagogy to both pupils and parents with marked success. The story centers in Chel, an orphan boy, outcast and abused, who gives the teacher the key to the situation which she uses wisely and well.

B. H. DEMENT.

Zur Theologischen Religionspsychologie. Von G. Vorbrodt. M. 1.20. A. Deichert, Leipzig.

This brochure endeavors to bring the psychology of religion into the service of the theologian. The first essay shows the relation of general and religious psychology to each other and also their relation to apologetics and pastoral duties. The second essay attempts to establish right relations between apologetics and religious psychology. The empirical thinking of our day

is penetrating theology and the Church, and to it we look for the establishment of harmony between doctrine and life. The study of religious psychology will aid in the proper understanding of the development of the soul and help in determining the best methods of moral and religious instruction which should be vital and genetic rather than formal and catechetical.

B. H. DEMENT.

II.—CHURCH HISTORY.

The Struggle for Christian Truth in Italy. By Giovanni Luzzi, D.D., Professor in the Waldensian Seminary, Florence, Italy. Revell Co., New York. 1913. 338 pages. Price, \$1.50.

To five lectures recently delivered at various seminaries in America, Prof. Luzzi has added two additional chapters and thus made a very readable and instructive book of seven chapters. In the first two he sketches the history of Christianity in Italy to the close of the Reformation, with special reference to all forms of opposition to the growing hierarchy and the later dominant Catholic Church. This work is not particularly well done and there are some mistakes as to dates, etc. On page 33, note 41, the rise of Montanism is placed in the middle of the third instead of the second century; in note 46, page 35, it is said that Constantine declared Christianity to be the religion of the Empire in 324, while as a matter of fact Constantine expressly gave equal freedom to all religions. On page 59 things are badly jumbled, as will appear from the two following quotations: "In this classic year, 1400, three Councils were held * * * the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Bâle." As a matter of fact the Council of Pisa convened in 1409, that of Constance in 1415 and that of Bâle in 1431. Again: "The Babylonian captivity, which lasted seventy years, and presented the spectacle of two Popes: one at Avignon, and the other at Rome." The facts are that during the Babylonian Captivity there was only one Pope, and he was at Avignon. The two Popes reigned during the great Schism that followed the so-called Captivity.

But if the work in these chapters is not very satisfactory, that in the following ones is much more adequate and accurate. The third chapter on "The Dramatic History of the Bible in Italy" is of surpassing interest. The next two on the work and sufferings of the Waldenses, and the contribution of other forms of evangelical Christianity like that of the Baptists and Methodists in the latter part of the nineteenth century, are inspiring and in places thrilling. His criticisms of the missionary methods of the denominations who have come from the outside into Italy are suggestive and worthy of consideration by all who are doing missionary work in a land that is nominally Christian.

Chapter VI., "In the Land of Exile," is on the religious life of Italian patriots who were driven into exile before 1870, for political and religious reasons. It brings out a beautiful side of the life of these Italian exiles which is not generally known.

The last chapter is on "Modernism," or the effort at reform now in progress in the Catholic Church. Although the movement has been so far eliminated from the Church as to disappear from the columns of the daily press, the author regards it as still alive, active and very promising. In fact he believes it to be far more religious now than a few years ago. The liberalistic and socialistic features have largely disappeared as motives, he thinks, while the religious motive has been strengthened. It is earnestly hoped that he is correct in this latter contention, but the reviewer cannot feel so optimistic as to the future as the author. History affords no single ray of hope that the Catholic Church can be reformed. If a man would be free and religions he must abandon it. It can be reformed only by its destruction.

Here and there infelicities of language and the choice of a wrong synonym proclaim the fact that the author is not an Englishman, but the work, as a whole, is a very valuable and important addition to the historical literature of Italian Christianity.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Manual of Early Ecclesiastical History to 476 A. D. By Chas. L. Wells, Ph.D. University Press, Sewanee, Tenn. 1912. 259 pages.

This volume is one in the "Sewanee Theological Library," "intended to provide for the clergy and laity of the Church a statement, in convenient form, of its Doctrine, Discipline and Worship. The "Church" to which reference is here made is the American Episcopal Church. The purpose of the book is, therefore, distinctly practical and ecclesiastical, its primary object being to serve a special need of one denomination. As would be expected it does not show the usual freedom of unhampered scholarship, taking the position, for example, that infant baptism and the three orders of the ministry existed from the very beginning of Christianity. The arguments adduced in support of the three orders of the clergy are ludicrous.

But when this stricture has been made it must be said that the book is a very valuable compendium for its purpose. It manifests genuine scholarship, and as much freedom as would reasonably be expected under the circumstances. Topics are treated with a clearness, orderliness and fulness that make the volume highly interesting and valuable to the classes for which it was intended. Carefully considered references to much of the best recent literature of the subjects treated add a feature of worth even for those who are already well acquainted with the theme.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum. By Louise Fargo Brown, Ph.D., Instructor in History in Wellesley College. Oxford University Press. 1912. 258 pages.

This work won the prize of the American Historical Association for 1911, which is high endorsement of its merits. It covers the period from the death of Charles I to the Restoration under Charles II, 1649 to 1660. These were notable years in the history of the English Baptists. For this brief period they were probably more influential in the public life of England than at any time since. For ten years they had multiplied rap-

idly, heartily supporting the cause of Parliament and Cromwell. The army was full of them and when Cromwell came to supreme power they were given many important posts in the civil administration. As time went on they were less favorable to Cromwell and his military regime and when Charles was restored they were accused of complicity in the rebellious plotting of the Fifth Monarchy Men who broke into open rebellion in January, 1661. They denied all complicity in this treasonable movement, but suffered considerable hardship because of the suspicion.

The exact status of the relations existing between them and the Fifth Monarchy Men has never been determined, hence the importance of this work of Miss Brown. It is based upon original sources and seems to be careful and exhaustive. There are some mistakes as to fact which renders one a trifle apprehensive as to accuracy at points where the work cannot be tested. For example in the quotation from the Confession of John Smith on page 7 several important clauses are omitted without any indication that anything is wanting. On the same page it is said that Smith died before 1611, whereas he is known to have died in 1612.

The author admits that "the Baptists of England were all advocates of liberty of conscience," but declares that it "was too often theoretical rather than practical." This assertion is made on the basis of charges made against some Baptist officials in Ireland by Quakers chiefly. Of course there may have been here and there a Baptist politician who did not measure up to the full significance of Baptist principles. This phenomenon is not entirely wanting in modern times. But the author has undoubtedly exaggerated the significance of these charges, and the reviewer is by no means convinced by the evidence adduced that they ever actually showed any real intolerance.

The author finds that very few Baptists were in any degree sympathetic with either the views or the treasonable designs of the Fifth Monarchy Men.

The work is a valuable addition to our Baptist literature. In addition to the text by the author there is much important in-

formation as to sources and later works which makes the book an unusually significant one for our history.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources. By Carl Clemen, Ph.D., D.D., Professor in the University of Bonn. Translated by R. G. Nisbet, Lecturer in Latin in the University of Glasgow. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. 1912. 430 pages.

It was time that a serious effort should have been made to test the large claims made by some that Christianity in its extra-Jewish ideas is mere heathen philosophy and mysticism from the "Mystery Religions." On the flimsiest pretexts the whole structure of Christianity has been torn down as of no more value than Gnosticism and Mithraism. The conflict of Paul with incipient Gnosticism is manifest in Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles. It appears also in the Gospel and Epistles of John. Clemen does not admit the genuineness of Ephesians and II. Timothy. It is still a disputed question whether Paul was personally acquainted with Mithraism and was influenced by it in his view of baptism and the Lord's Supper. It has not yet been shown to be true, but it is clear that Paul did not live in seclusion. He knew Gnosticism, Stoicism, Epicurianism, and possibly Mithraism, and combated them all.

Clemen's book is one of very great importance and value.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Bible Reading in the Early Church. By Adolph Harnack; translated by J. R. Wilkinson, M.A. Putnam's, N. Y. 1912. 159 pages. Price \$1.50.

Harnack's authorship is sufficient guarantee of the thoroughness and value of this little work. No important material bearing on the subject has been overlooked or neglected. The work deals with the private reading of the Scriptures in the homes by the laity and women rather than the public reading by the clergy in the church services, which has often been treated. For American and English readers a long introductory disquisition on the controversy between Lessing, Goeze and Walch might have been omitted without loss to the value of the book.

The pleasure of the reading is also somewhat marred by the fact that the purpose of the book is partly polemical, to show by actual historical investigation that there were no restrictions laid upon the laity in the matter of Bible reading in the first four centuries. It is in short a scientific, historical polemic against the Catholic Church in its restrictions on Bible reading. Its scientific value is not vitiated by its polemical purposes, but the pleasure of its reading is.

It is conclusively shown that the clergy not only did not restrict but warmly recommended Bible reading by the laity, that the Scriptures were actually widely read and circulated and that by the end of the fourth century they had largely superceded the classics as a means of culture. The practical value of the Bible as a means of spiritual culture has never had a more convincing demonstration.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Ursprung und Geschichte der Mormonen mit Exkursen über die Anfänge des Islams und des Christentums. Von Eduard Meyer. Max Niemeyer, Halle a. S., 1912. Ss. 300.

The author of this work in true German fashion made use of a portion of his time during a recent visit to this country in acquainting himself with the history and characteristics of the Mormons. On his return to his native land he finished the work for the enlightenment of his people, some of whom have been won for this strange religion. Some of the sources, especially the prophecies, he has used diligently and successfully. We now have in English some really excellent books on Mormonism, notably those of Linn and Riley. These and other treatises the author has also made large use of. The result of his somewhat hasty labors is a very good history of the movement so far as its outward aspects are concerned. There is not that penetration into the inner meaning of the whole which we have learned to expect from a German scholar; but the work will unquestionably be useful in acquainting the Germans with this new modern heathenism masquerading under the Christian name.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Story of the Cambridge Baptists and the Struggle for Religious Liberty. By Bernard Nutter, M.A. Cambridge; W. Heffner & Sons. 1912.

The Baptists of Cambridge and Cambridgeshire have had an honorable history, and it is well to have it told as a separate story. Several of the leading figures of English Baptist history have been more or less closely connected with this county, such as Robert Robinson, Robt. Hall, Andrew Fuller and C. H. Spurgeon. Many men of less note have faithfully stood by the truth through evil report and good report, through much suffering and obloquy. The story is at points inspiring, and at others discouraging and even disheartening. There have been not only heroic suffering, but also petty bickering and strife.

In the volume under review the story is told in a rather fragmentary way, and is devoted to individuals too largely to give an adequate conception of the work as a whole. In a brief volume of 173 pages three chapters are devoted to Robinson. Moreover the treatemnt so intertwines the history of the Dissenters as a whole that it is difficult to disentangle the Baptists whose work is supposed to be the subject of the book. However, there is much that is illuminating, especially in matters concerning the inner life and practices of the early days. The later history is scarcely touched. If one is searching for a history of the Cambridge Baptists as a whole he will be disappointed, but if he desires to know something about the early history he will find this book useful.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Religious Forces of the United States, etc. By H. K. Carroll, LL.D. Revised and brought down to 1910. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1912. 488 pages.

This volume is already well known to all students of American church history. The present revision greatly increases its value, not only because it brings the best available information concerning the religious forces of the United States down to the census of 1910, but also because there are rearrangements, re-

statements and comparisons that materially increase its value. There is here a complete exhibit of all the religious forces of the United States according to the latest and most reliable statistics obtainable. In connection with these figures there is in all cases a concise but clear account of the origin, organizations and beliefs of the particular party there under consideration. This part of the work has been done exceedingly well.

The volume contains the most satisfactory presentation, in compact form, of the religious bodies and conditions to be found in the United States.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Authoritative Life of General William Booth, Founder of the Salvation Army. By G. S. Railton, First Commissioner to Gen. Booth. Doran & Co., New York. 331 pages. \$1.00.

This work has been gotten out very hurriedly of course, to forestall unauthorized biographies and catch the popular interest aroused by the General's recent death. A vast deal of material has not been utilized, so that it cannot be called a scientific and definitive life of its subject; but the title "authoritative" seems to be justified in the sense that the information here given is correct and in just perspective. The author has been one of the General's most intimate friends and fellow workers during most of his active career, and is thereby qualified for the task of writing a biography by intimate personal knowledge as scarcely anybody else could be. Moreover, he discloses a good deal of the breadth and fairness that should characterize a biographer even when treating the life of an intimate friend. In fact the work consists very largely of extracts from the writings of the General himself and from those who are reporting on his work and influence first hand. Unfortunately dates are frequently omitted where they are important to a clear understanding of the sequence of events. A little care here would have materially enhanced the value of the volume. But for all the practical purposes of the average reader who is seeking to know the salient and important facts connected with the personality of the General and the founding, methods and work of

the Army the book will be found amply sufficient. And it is a biography that ought to be read by all religious workers. The spirit and purposes that speak from its pages are the supreme need of the Christian Church throughout the world to-day. We are too much hampered by traditions, too devoted to the externals of religion to possess the power of the Spirit in sufficient measure. The great purposes of Booth expressed in short, sharp, snappy sentences must affect every reader whose heart has any of the characteristics of the Master, with new fire and purpose. It is a biography to have in the library and read more than once. Where the interest in men is flagging or the evangelistic note weakening it will act as a most powerful tonic and stimulant. Let it be read widely not for its literary but for its religious value.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

The Friar of Wittenberg. By William Stearnes Davis. The Macmillan Company. 1912. 432 pages. \$1.35, net.

Often more vivid impressions of historical situations can be gleaned from historical stories than from histories. The story deals with the personal and incidental which cannot be touched in the history, but which give vitality and life-likeness to the whole. This volume is a very good story as a story, and by the intimate knowledge of the history possessed by its author it has been made an effective study of the Reformation in those personal human elements which are usually absent from the histories. It begins with Luther's visit to Rome in 1511 and ends with Luther at the Wartburg. This period is greatly illuminated. Every student of the Reformation should read it.

The Ground Plan of the English Parish Church;
Historical Growth of the English Parish Church. Both by A. H. Thomson. Cambridge University Press. Each, 40c, net.

These small volumes are in the series of "Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature" and together form an interesting and valuable study of the English Parish Church building

both as to its ground plan and its other features and appointments. We have long had an extensive literature of the cathedrals, but the parish churches, many of which are very beautiful and impressive, have been neglected. The author of these little volumes is evidently widely acquainted with these buildings by actual personal investigation, and his work greatly helps us to understand the parish architecture. In some respects these buildings have been of more worth to the nation than the cathedrals.

The Heroes of the Meeting-House. By E. C. Pike, B.A. Kingsgate Press, London. 1912. 140 pages. 1 shilling.

This volume consists of three lectures delivered by the late author in various parts of England on the history of Nonconformity in that country. The first deals with the general principles and life of the Nonconformists, with special references to their sufferings after the Restoration in 1660. Numerous extracts from contemporary records make the story very real and life-like. The other two lectures are on two of the most distinguished and influential sufferers of that time, George Fox, the founder of the Quakers and John Bunyan, the Baptist. The volume will aid the reader to understand the issues involved and appreciate the heroic steadfastness of the sufferers as well as appreciate the freedom and light of his own age.

The Things Methodists Believe. By T. H. Lipscomb, B.D. M. E. Publishing House, Nashville. 26 pages. 10 cents.

A very good statement of the points in which Methodists agree with and differ from other Christians—Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, all others. The conclusion of the author from his survey of the whole field of agreement and disagreement is that “organic and complete union is impossible even if desirable. A union of spirit, however, in constant recognition of our agreement on things essential, and our equal right to be called children of God, and ministers of Jesus Christ, is surely possible.”

III.—BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

John Baptist and His Relation to Jesus. With some account of His Following. By Allan Blakiston, M.A. J. & J. Bennett, London. 1912. 273 pages. Price 6s. net.

Mr. Blakiston has produced a very careful piece of work and he shows much insight and exercises discrimination in the main as is shown by his scholarly notes. In his "Appended Notes" he gives much material of value. Chapter X he calls "The Growth of the Baptist Sect," a discussion of the misguided followers of John of whom we have a glimpse in Acts 19. Mr. Blakiston (p. 22) says: "At a later stage, as we shall see, John did found his school of disciples." I do not believe that the facts justify this statement. This later "school" grew up under a misapprehension of John's real mission.

Mr. Blakiston is also a sacramentalist, or at any rate he makes Jesus out so: "Now the baptism of Jesus stands alone, as being strictly sacramental," (p. 23). John's baptism merely "symbolized a change of heart and life" while Jesus retained the water baptism "as its outward expression and means of conveyance" (p. 23). Thus it appears that at crucial points Mr. Blakiston misunderstands both John and Jesus. This defect mars the book very greatly.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K. C. B., F. B. A., Director and Principal Librarian, British Museum. Second Edition. With sixteen facsimiles. Macmillan & Co., London and New York. 1912. Price, 5s. net. 381 pages.

There is no better discussion in English of the material for the criticism of the New Testament. The author has abundant knowledge and handles the subject with rare skill. The facsimiles help the student to understand the discussion. The latest phases of the problem are treated with sanity and insight. The discussion of the method of textual criticism is briefer than one could wish, but the competent teacher can sup-

plement at this point. The student needs practical training to learn how to apply the new knowledge. But it is superfluous to praise this standard book, made all the more useful by additions in the new edition.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Apocalypse of Jesus; Being a Step in the Search for the Historical Christ. By F. W. Worsley, M.A., B.D. 1912. J. & J. Bennett, London. 362 pages. Price 2s. 6d., net.

Mr. Worsley has done a very careful piece of work in which he shows Mr. Schweitzer errs in making "eschatology" the keynote in the teaching of Jesus. The ethical note is really dominant and the eschatological secondary.

Mr. Worsley makes the point, and proves it also, that all the apocalyptic element in the teaching of Jesus is not eschatological. For instance, the term "Son of Man" is apocalyptic, but not eschatological. On the whole the book is a good correction to the extreme position of Schweitzer. Certainly the subject is one of serious interest and calls for wise treatment and balanced judgment.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Text and Canon of the New Testament. By Alexander Souter, D.Litt. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1913. 253 pages. Price, 75c, net.

The book belongs to the "Studies in Theology" and is an able contribution to its subject. As a text-book it would perhaps have been more serviceable if it had been confined to "Text" as this subject is not always taught in connection with "Canon." But both are ably handled by Dr. Souter. His qualifications for this task are well known and abundantly shown by his *Novum Testamentum Graece*, pronounced by Kenyon (Textual Criticism of the N. T., p. 312) as "incomparably the best for general use." The discussion of the Text covers only 145 pages, but it presents the whole subject with wonderful clearness and completeness. Unfortunately (p. 31) little was known of the Washington Manuscript of the Gospels when

Dr. Souter wrote. I am glad to note (p. 125) the statement that B has here and there Western readings, even in the Gospels, as I have long contended. Both this book by Souter and the *Handbook* by Kenyon are deficient as text-books in the actual discussion of passages (praxis) in comparison with Warfield's *Introduction* (now out of print), though in fulness of modern knowledge they both far surpass it. But Souter's book is a delightful book for the student and ought to have a wide use.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," with Their Bearing on Date and Place of Authorship. By Ora Delmar Foster, Ph.D. Introduction by B. W. Bacon, D.D., Litt.D., LL.D. Yale University Press, New Haven. 1913.

Dr. Foster has done a fine piece of work in the collection of the material bearing on the literary affinities of First Peter. He has tabulated them with great care and given them in an objective form so that one can draw one's own conclusions. By no means all of the "relations" here presented are conclusive. Many may be due to the common stock of thought and language of the time. But enough remain to be of great interest whether they lead up to First Peter or come from this Epistle. Prof. Bacon agrees with Dr. Foster in concluding that the data point to a date about A. D. 90 in view of the "fiery trial" in Asia Minor which must be in the time of Domitian since the persecution under Nero was local. But is it certain that Nero's persecution was purely local? Is not the second arrest of Paul apparently in Nicopolis, an illustration of a more widespread persecution? The provinces were quick to follow the lead of Rome.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Eglise Chrétienne. Par E. Jacquier. Tome Premier: Preparation, formation et définition du Canon du Nouveau Testament. 1911. Deuxieme Edition. 450 pages. Tome Second: Le Texte du Nouveau Testament. 1913. 535 pages. Librairie Victor Lecoffre (J. Gabalda Editeur), Paris.

The Abbé Jacquier teaches in the Roman Catholic University in Lyons and is one of the most competent scholars in France. He is thoroughly alert on all linguistic questions, as is seen in his *Historie des Livres du N. T.* He is doing a most useful service for New Testament scholarship in France. *Tome Premier* is now in the second edition and shows that his discussion of the Canon was welcomed. On p. VI. of *Tome Second*, Dr. Jacquier notes that his book on *Le Texte du N. T.* is the only one in French since the work by Paulin Martin is now out of print. There is now therefore a useful and adequate treatment of the whole subject for French students. His discussion of the Versions is especially full and helpful.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Des Hebräerbrief Erklärt von Lic. Dr. Hans Windisch, Privatdozent an der Universität Leipzig. Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, Germany. 1913. 122 pages. Pr. 2:40 M. Bound, 3.40 M. *Lieferung* 28/29. Band iv. 3. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.

The preceding numbers of this able and useful series of commentaries on the New Testament have been noticed already. The present volume comes up to the high standard already set with a shade less accent on the linguistic side of exegesis. But Windisch is fully aware of the difficulties confronting him in the critical problems belonging to Hebrews. His tone is not dogmatic as to authorship, date, and destination, but he surveys the whole problem from all sides. He follows, however, the beaten track in seeing the end of the discussion of the priestly work of Christ at 10:18 instead of 12:3 (p. 9), the "better promises" (8:6) on which it rests.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein Ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte? Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho. Von Adolf Harnack. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Leipzig. 1913. 98 pages. Price 3 M. *Texte und Untersuchungen* xxxix. 1.

In the first paper Harnack combats with his usual vigor and clearness the idea of Norden (*Agnostos Theos*. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede) that the speech of Paul at Athens belongs not to the "Autor ad Theophilum," but to a Redactor who made use of the speeches of Apollonius in Athens and hence the Book of Acts belongs to the second century. It is a clean argument, but Harnack has no trouble in meeting it and in showing that Luke is the author of the book as a whole and had varied sources for the work. The discussion of the Dialogue with Typho is equally lucid.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach. In the Revised Version and Notes. By W. O. Oesterley, D.D., Jesus College, Cambridge. The Cambridge University Press (G. P. Putnam's Sons), New York. 1912. 367 pages. Price, 6s., net.

Mr. Oesterley opposes Mr. J. H. A. Hart's view (*Ecclesiasticus*, pp. 249ff.) that the original was written about 300 B. C. and argues for a date about 190 B. C. The discussion of the question of the original Hebrew is satisfactory. The exposition of the teaching of the book is very clear and suggestive. The volume makes a good companion for Mr. Hart's edition of the Greek text.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Book of Wisdom, with Introduction and Notes. Edited by Rev. A. T. S. Goodrick, M.A., Bristol. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1913. 437 pages. Price, \$2.00, net.

The editor has treated 'Wisdom' with all the care of a commentator on the N. T. He admits (p. IX.) that the book was written originally in Greek, but he denies (p. IX, p. 240) that the author is at home in the *Koine*. He thinks that he writes as a Jew in a foreign language, not in the vernacular. It may be, however, that this writer is affecting the stilted rhetoric of the Atticists (cf. Josephus). He certainly shows knowledge of Greek philosophy. But Mr. Goodrich has done an excellent

piece of work which offers real help to the student. The notes are full and informing.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Life and Teachings of Jesus According to the Earliest Records. By Charles Foster Kent, Ph.D., Litt.D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University; with map and chart. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. xiii+337 pages. \$1.25, net.

This volume in Scribner's "Historical Bible" is by the editor of the series. It is the first such Life of Jesus, on a scale for general use, based directly on the recent critical, historical work on the Gospels. Naturally, therefore, there is a good deal of explanatory and critical material. The Gospel-text, so to say, is taken from what criticism has concluded to be the original sources of our Gospels. This text is printed in heavy type in topical sections and the author's notes follow these sections, except an extended general introduction.

The origin, method and dates, of our Gospels are accepted according to the well known critical results of recent years, and all are placed within the first century, including John.

The insight and appreciation with which the author generally discusses the facts and meaning of Jesus' life make the more notable the occasional over-looking of some of the most vital aspects, e. g. in connection with the baptism of Jesus. The dealing with miracles is cautious. The physical resurrection of Jesus is held to be unnecessary to Christianity and is probably not to be accepted. The attitude is reverent and vital. The volume is the one wholly "up-to-date" handbook life of Jesus.

W. O. CARVER.

God's Apostle and High Priest. By Philip Mauro. Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London. Two shillings, net.

There is always a freshness in any study by a man who comes from another line of life, well equipped by general training; and Mr. Mauro has already proved himself no mean Bible student. He here presents three aspects of our Lord's relation to us: The Apostle of our confession, revealing the Father, and

finishing that work before the Last Supper; the Minister of the heavenly tabernacle, even now as High Priest representing us before God; the eternal Priest, one day to enter on his Melchisedec royalty, and inaugurate a new order of things throughout the universe. Mr. Mauro has done well to emphasize the importance of the epistle to the Hebrews, and to throw into relief the teaching as to our Savior, so much needed at this time.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written: The Gospel According to Luke. By D. A. Hayes, Garrett Biblical Institute. Jennings & Graham, Cincinnati. 1913. 183 pages. Price, 75c.

Professor Hayes has put in popular form what we know about Luke along with the legends about him and it makes a readable story. The book will create fresh interest in the Gospel and Acts.

The Sevenfold "I Am." By the Rev. Thomas Marjoribanks, B.D. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. 147 pages. Price, 60c. 1913.

Here we have another volume in the "Short Course Series" of Expository sermons. The sermons are crisp, practical and helpful. The texts are "I am the light of the World;" "I am the door;" "I am the way, the truth, and the life;" "I am the good Shepherd;" "I am the bread of life;" "I am the vine;" "I am the resurrection and the life."

Problems of the Passion Week. By A. M. Haggard, Drake University. Des Moines, Iowa. Price, 15c.

The author argues earnestly, but not convincingly, for Thursday as the Crucifixion Day of Christ.

The Evolution of the Kingdom. By Rev. W. B. Riley, D.D. Chas. C. Cook, New York. 1913. 188 pages. Price, 75c.

Dr. Riley is an enthusiastic Pre-millennarian and writes with confidence and vigor in this exposition of that view of the Mes-

sianic Kingdom. One who wishes this view expounded can here find it done with great clearness, persuasiveness, passion for souls, and love for Christ.

The Problem of Jesus. By George Dana Boardman. Revised Edition. Philadelphia. The Griffith & Rowland Press. 1913. 63 pages.

This little work, splendidly printed, gives a vigorous and clear argument for the deity of our Lord and then presses briefly "the practical problem; what will you do with Him?" Having gone through several editions it was revised before the author's death and is now given in the revised form. The argument is mainly that from the conscious and the unconscious influence of Jesus in the life of man and the lives of men.

The Book of Job. By Homer B. Sprague, Ph.D. Sherman, French & Co., Boston. 1913. 243 pages. \$1.25, net.

The Book of Job. Interpreted by James Strahan, M.A., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913. To be had of Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York. Pp. 356.

Dr. Sprague turns the Hebrew of Job into English verse. His work is equal to that of any of his predecessors who have sought to render the poem into modern verse. Having had large experience as an editor of the works of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and other literary masterpieces, Dr. Sprague knows how to introduce the general reader to the Book of Job. His quotations from Shakespeare, Homer, Milton, Tennyson, Browning and other great poets are numerous and well chosen. This feature alone would make the book a valuable addition to the library of a Bible student. Dr. Sprague also knows how to enlist the reader in the personality and the thought of the author whom he is interpreting. Large use has been made of the best literature on the Book of Job, the varying views of commentators and literary critics finding expression in the Explanatory Notes at the end of the volume.

Dr. Sprague inveighs against the usual interpretation that the speech of the Almighty out of the whirlwind brings to Job the sense of God's sympathetic interest in the suffering saint.

He writes: "Of the vindication the slandered one longed for, of the reason why the torture was permitted, of the hearing he so sought, of a life beyond the grave, of tender love from his Creator, of spirits interested in human beings, of the immunity of the greatest villains—of any of these things, not a syllable! Is it not a fair inference that, in the opinion of our author, upon such matters, there is nothing that a Voice which only speaks out from whirlwind and thunder *can* say?" What Dr. Sprague fails to find in the Book of Job he discovers in the New Testament, especially in Romans 8:19-30, interpreted in the light of Evolution. This view makes the Book of Job valuable chiefly as a crushing polemic against the view that suffering is the result of God's wrath against sin. The best man in the world is pictured as the greatest sufferer.

Dr. Sprague also departs from the current interpretation when he suggests that Job's reason at times failed him. "If we regard Job as all the while of sound mind, the difficulties arising from his frenzied utterances, inconsistencies, and abrupt incoherencies appear insoluble. It enhances the pathos of the situation to conjecture that, under the stress of terrible afflictions, his brain may have become at times disordered." As to Chapter XXVIII, he remarks: "It reads like a sublime soliloquy, spoken by Job in a lucid interval."

Mr. Strahan's book is mainly exegetical, on the basis of the text of the Revised Version of 1885. In charming style the author discusses the topics introductory to the study of the poet's argument. He is at home in the literature dealing with the Book of Job, and seldom advances any new views, though weighing carefully the judgments of his predecessors and displaying insight and balance in his preferences and verdicts.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

The Rule of Life and Love: An Exposition of the Ten Commandments. By the Rev. R. L. Ottley, D.D. Demy 8 vo., cloth. London: Robert Scott. 238 pages. 5s. net.

Canon Ottley contributes his second volume to the Library of Historic Theology, edited by the Rev. Wm. C. Piercy, the

first being entitled "The Rule of Faith and Hope." Dr. Ottley traces the Ten Commandments back to Moses. He thinks that the Commandments were originally all brief like the sixth, seventh and eighth. Dr. Ottley makes large use of the early Christian fathers, such as Ignatius, Irenæus and Augustine, and of mediaeval scholars, such as Thomas Aquinas and Bernard of Clairvaux. He also quotes from Hooker, Barrow, Bishop Butler and other English divines. The reader is impressed with the fact that the author has been at pains to learn what the Ten Commandments have meant to Jews and Christians throughout the three millenniums since they were first given to Moses. These extensive historical studies have naturally had a tendency to eliminate excessive originality of view or method; but the outcome is a sane and balanced discussion of the many difficult problems connected with the Decalogue.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Ancient Babylonia. By C. H. W. Johns, Litt. D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1913. 148 pages. 40c, net.

Dr. Johns has packed into a small volume a great deal of valuable information concerning one of the earliest centers of human civilization. The needs of beginners in historic research are kept in mind, and they are enabled to get their bearings in the midst of the multitudinous details of changing dynasties. Special attention is given to great Kings like Hammurabi and Nebuchadrezzar. Points of contact with the Old Testament receive proper notice. Dr. Johns has made a highly useful manual.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

Die Schriften des Alten Testaments. 21 Lieferung: Das Judentum (von der Neugründung Jerusalems bis zur Gesetzgebung durch Esra) von M. Haller. Bogen 10-14. 22 Lieferung: Die Anfänge Israels (vom 2 Buch Moses bis Richter) von Hugo Gressmann. Bogen 6-10. 23 Lieferung: Die grossen Propheten, und ihre Zeit, von Hans Schmidt. Bogen 6-10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1912 and 1913. May be had of Lemcke & Buechner, New York. Price, 80 Pf. each.

Haller treats of the work of Ezra and Nehemiah as leaders and reformers, and relates them to the completion and adoption of the priestly legislation in the manner common to critical scholars. He places Habakkuk in the period of Alexander the Great. Gressmann gives us brief selections from the historical portions of Exodus and the books that follow to Joshua. Schmidt presents the messages of Isaiah and Micah. The style is popular and pleasing. The criticism is that of the Wellhausen school.

JOHN R. SAMPEY.

IV.—THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

Foundations: A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought. By Seven Oxford Men. London, 1913. Macmillan & Co. (New York, The Macmillan Company). xi+538 pages. \$3.50, net.

The distinctly conservative movement at Oxford is very gratifying. Possibly constructive would be the better descriptive term. Concerted efforts among Oxford scholars to vitalize Christian theology in terms of modern thinking, when based on personal and social experience, cannot but issue in advantage to Christianity. This volume is by young men, unhampered by the responsibilities of official ecclesiastical position and who feel called upon to put forward "experiments" in thought and statement. Such a work, the reader may be sure, will be stimulating and suggestive, while by its very form and profession it challenges independence, and even dissent, on the part of the reader. There are nine essays on vital issues, so related as to make a connected whole and fairly well to cover the field of fundamentals. "The Modern Situation" is presented by the Rev. N. S. Talbot, M.A., Fellow, Tutor and Chaplain of Balliol College. "The Bible" is discussed by the Rev. R. Brook, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Merton College, Lecturer in Theology at Merton and Oriel Colleges, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield. The position is that of liberal conservatism.

The Rev. B. H. Streeter, M. A., contributes, besides the brief "Introduction," the essay on "The Historic Christ." He is Fellow, Dean and Lecturer in Queen's College, Lecturer also in

Hartford College and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Albans. His discussion is one of great learning and the writer walks confidently along a road at which many would hesitate. The limitations of Jesus, the Christ, he accepts quite fully and not only fails to defend, but positively attacks, the physical resurrection of the Lord. He thinks this is no essential part of a vital faith and is far removed from the need of us with our modern philosophical and scientific attitudes.

"The Interpretation of the Christ in the New Testament," is a splendidly suggestive discussion of theological development in the first century by the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, M.A., of Keble College, but giving credit for large contribution to the Rev. R. G. Parsons, M.A., Principal of Wells Theological College. Mr. Rawlinson also discusses "The Principle of Authority." The discussion starts from the standpoint of the classical usage of the word "*auctoritas*," undertakes to trace the evolution of personal experience in relation to authority, criticises the "mistaken" opposition of "authority" and "the spirit." "Authority and Church Order" naturally leads on to a consideration of "Authority and Reunion." In both these topics the characteristic Episcopal attitude is presented and the Episcopal Church is found to be the true and proper home for all varieties of Christians.

An appendix results in reluctant admission that "Any defense of the principle * * * of Apostolical Succession must be based on other than strictly (sic!) historical grounds." The "attempt to defend the principle" is made in the body of the discussion. It is based on the sacramentarian idea.

"The Divinity of Christ" is boldly defended, but the consciousness that the defense must always be relative and tentative, by the Rev. W. Temple, M.A., Headmaster of Repton, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who also discusses "The Church" in a very spiritual way but dominated by the sacramentarian idea.

W. H. Moberly, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Philosophy of Lincoln College, is the seventh essayist, presenting the delicate subject of "The Atonement" and the difficult one of "God and

the Absolute." The Atonement is conceived in a profoundly ethical sense. The philosophical position is that of a spiritual Absolutism personalized in a way to conserve the religious interests of man.

In general it may be said that these essays seek to steer in a middle course, conserving elements of older views and adopting new views or new methods to combine with the old. The work will at least achieve its most distinctly announced purpose, of stimulating thought along lines of constructive restatement of belief in terms of experience and modern thinking.

W. O. CARVER.

Freedom and Authority in Religion. By Edgar Young Mullins, D.D., LL.D., President and Professor of Theology in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.; author of "Why is Christianity True?" and "Axioms of Religion." Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press. 1913. 410 pages. \$1.50, net.

Dr. Mullins has here grappled the most difficult problem in the theory and practice of religion. He opens the discussion with a chapter on "The Modern Ideal of Freedom." The modern tendency toward radical individualism has been the characteristic trait of the century that lies just behind us, and has gone to greater extremes, perhaps, in the religious sphere than in any other department of life. A reaction from this extreme is now apparent in social thought and is making itself felt in religion also. The radical individualism of the recent past found theological expression in the extreme subjectiveness of writers like Sabatier, Lobstein and Martineau, who practically eliminated authority from religion altogether; for the claim that the Christian consciousness is the seat, or source, of authority really means that there is no authority, because objectivity is essential to the very notion. In a trenchant argument, the author exposes the inadequacy of this view.

He then takes up the question of the consciousness of Jesus as it comes to expression in the New Testament records and shows conclusively, it seems to me, that on the basis of the minimum record left by recent critical theories (excepting, of course,

the most radical view, which rejects in toto the historical value of the Gospels,) the messianic consciousness of Jesus must be accepted as a fact. Jesus claimed religious authority; and there is no way to evade this fact except by the violent assumption that Jesus himself was not a historic person.

After thus exposing the insufficiency of radical subjectivism and establishing the fact that the historic Jesus claimed authority, a claim that seems to be the natural and inevitable expression of His deepest consciousness and to be inseparably bound up with the ethical and religious value of His personality, the argument proceeds in two important chapters to show that neither science nor philosophy can either eliminate or satisfy the religious needs of men. In chapter V. it is shown that man comes to know reality through the reaction of his total nature upon it, in which process the intellect has its function, indeed, but does not by any means play the major role. It is by an act of faith, which is essentially a voluntary process, that the human spirit establishes vital connection with ultimate reality and assimilates or appropriates religious truth. The will is the central factor, on the human side, in the religious experience. This is a significant point in the argument, because rightful authority is addressed to the will rather than to the intellect.

From here on the argument closes in, through a series of five interesting and stimulating chapters on "The Principle of Authority, The Nature of Religion, Religious Knowledge, The Authority of Jesus Christ, The Place of the Bible in Christianity. In the first, it is shown how truth acquired in social experience is crystallized and externalized into canons, standards, institutions, which are authoritative; but not authoritative in the sense that they set absolute limits to the action of the individual intellect and will. Authority in the Roman Catholic sense of the word the author rejects without qualification. But he shows conclusively, that the establishment of authoritative norms of thought and of conduct by which each individual enters into and appropriates the results of past human experience is the method of progress in all spheres of life; and yet these norms or standards can promote life only as they are subjectively appropriated and submitted afresh to the test of experience in each genera-

tion. In this way the author thinks it possible that norms of truth may be established which, while theoretically open to criticism, are really above criticism and final; because criticism itself can proceed only on the assumption of their truth. In the realms of Logic and Ethics such norms have been established. Is it inconceivable that it may be so in Religion? And yet such finality does not deny the right to submit such norms to the test of personal experience.

Limited space forbids that we follow the discussion in detail. The chapter on Religious Knowledge I have found the least satisfactory in the book—not because the author is wrong in his main contention, but because the analysis seems to me less clear and discriminating. The chapter on The Authority of Jesus Christ is a fine, strong, impressive presentation of that great theme. To me it is the vital core of the book, and leaves nothing to be added on that subject. Religious authority in ultimate principle is *personal*; it is the will of God; Jesus is the embodiment of the divine nature, and is, therefore, the concrete and absolute religious authority. His authority, however, does not annul the intellectual and moral freedom of the Christian. On the contrary it guarantees, develops, fulfills that freedom. His authority lies in his supreme moral excellence and religious insight. It appeals to human freedom; and in obedience to him the soul becomes at once absolutely free and absolutely subject. Thus the apparent contradiction between freedom and authority is resolved in Christian experience.

The chapter on The Place of the Bible in Christianity is also eminently discriminating, and satisfactory. "The Bible is not a statute book in the legalistic sense." "It came not by legislation but by inspiration." "It is not even a book of rules, but rather of principles, infinitely expansive and adaptable." Its authority is due to "its disclosure of the inner constitution of the moral and spiritual universe, while leaving man free to conform to it." "The Bible is the revelation of the constitution of the personal Kingdom which includes God and man." The great Book is authoritative, in a word, because it communicates to us the supreme religious truths, mediates to us the supreme life.

Dr. Mullins would be the last man to imagine that he had spoken the final word on a theme so great and difficult as this. But he may well find satisfaction in the fact that he has written a suggestive and stimulating discussion of what may fairly be called the central theological issue of this age. Doubtless the positions he has taken will seem to some too liberal and to others too reactionary. As a matter of fact they are eminently conservative, in the best sense of the word, and helpfully constructive.

C. S. GARDNER.

Das Religiöse in der modernen Lyrik. Von Otto Frommel. Mohr, Tübingen, 1911. S. 71. M. 1.20.

This brochure brings to us a delightful study of the religious element in the modern lyric poetry of Germany since Goethe and Klopstock. The author is a man of keen insight and warm religious sympathies, is master of a clear and beautiful German style and is thoroughly acquainted with modern German literature. The lyric is studied in relation to the general intellectual and spiritual developments of the last century and a half. "Religious" is defined very broadly, so broadly that even Schopenhauer and Nietzsche are found to be religious. By "religious" the author means only the acceptance of some of the fundamental conceptions and attitudes of religion. Sharp distinctions are made in the kind of religion held by these various writers. All feel a freedom in dealing with religion that is absolutely personal. The church has lost its hold on their thinking and can no longer dominate literary views. Each man thinks and speaks as the matter impresses him individually. This being the case almost every modern poet has his own distinct viewpoint. On the whole the author finds most of the poets in some sense religious, but they are characterized rather by the longing of faith or for faith than by the certainty of faith. The evangelical note is almost wholly wanting. The Church will never sing many of the modern lyrics as it sings the compositions of Luther and Gerhardt. In short the German lyric is a true reflection of the doubting and striving and longing of the German people. One

who is interested in the inner religious life of the Germans will find this booklet both extremely interesting and valuable.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.

Foundation Truths of the Gospel. Morgan & Scott, Ltd., London.
One shilling, net.

Nineteen papers are here given, so arranged as to set forth the outlines of the evangelical creed, emphasizing Ruin, Redemption and Regeneration. With the constant uprise of strange teaching, sweeping badly instructed young Christians off their feet, there is constant need of sound instruction. The names of Meyer, Webster, Pierson, Varley, Anderson, indeed of all the seventeen authors, will raise expectations quite fulfilled, and it is not surprising that a third impression has already been called for.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Gift and the Life. By Theodore Monod. Morgan & Scott, Ltd.
One shilling, net.

Not often are addresses forty years old reprinted just as delivered. But while a book on chemistry or electricity would be absurdly out of date, a book dealing with the Gift of God, and with Life More Abundant, has to do with things that never change, and with experiences that are the same in every generation. The French Theologian worked not only in his native land, but in Britain and in Quebec, and the grace of his style, no less than the importance of his themes, should secure a wide circulation for this renewed issue, on both sides the Atlantic.

W. T. WHITLEY.

The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature: By James Y. Simpson, D. Sc., F.R.S.E., Professor of Natural Science, New College, Edinburgh. Hodder and Stoughton, New York and London [George H. Doran Company]. 1912. xv+383 pages. \$1.50 net.

The task of establishing a relation between science and religion is usually left to the theologian. It is very gratifying to find now and then a scientist who sees the same opportunity and feels the same responsibility. When that scientist is one of eminence and ability and at the same time one who understands clearly the positions and values of religious faith it is especially to be welcomed that he contributes to the adjustment and mutual advantage of the two realms for the general service of humanity. The author of this volume speaks with the voice of authority in modern science and with the voice of experience and appreciation in religion. The reader will be glad to accompany such a guide in such topics as these, among others: "Influence of Science upon Religious Thought," "Principles of Biology," "Evolution," "Heredity," "Evolution and Evil," "Science and Miracle," "Evolution and Immortality." It is a notable and welcome volume. It should do as much for scientists as for preachers, for the scientist cannot escape religious duty in the social organism.

W. O. CARVER.

Spiritual Law in Natural Fact: By J. C. Armstrong, D.D. Philadelphia, The Griffith and Rowland Press. 1913. 128 pages, 50 cents.

In this little volume Dr. Armstrong has not undertaken the pretentious task of showing at length the divine force and presence in natural law. That fact is only partially and generally discussed. His is the more practical and more widely useful work of illustrating and enforcing spiritual laws by illustrations and suggestions from natural law as seen and used in every-day life. In this way he enforces such topics as accountability, prayer, sin and salvation. It is a book of parables and exposition of parables as well as of apologetics based on natural law. It is a delightful little volume.

W. O. CARVER.

The World We Live In: Or Philosophy and Life in the Light of Modern Thought. By George Stuart Fullerton, Professor of Philosophy in Columbia University, New York. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1913. xi+293 pages. \$1.50 net.

This is a trenchant and altogether vigorous indictment of all forms of modern philosophy, including pragmatism, for unreality and separation from actual life in their dealing with the problems of being. "The World We Live In" is "Everybody's World" and a philosophy that soars in the air and presents as fact what is unintelligible, and, when explained, unreal to the every-day man, is no true or practical philosophy of existence. The volume presents a fine plea for conservative regard for the traditional forms of thought and faith, as products of history and so not essentially irrational. The continuity of history does not free us from the "jolts" of new truth, but does exempt us from the demand that all the past be treated as superstitions and worthless. "The will to believe," resting as it does on the more fundamental "will to live," is to be treated not alone with reverence because of sentiment but with respect because of worth.

The author writes with a fluent, popular style influenced by a playful and bantering humor that makes reading easy.

W. O. CARVER.

The Fitness of the Environment; An Inquiry into the Biological Significance of the Properties of Matter: By Lawrence J. Henderson, Assistant Professor of Biological Chemistry in Harvard University. In Part Delivered as Lectures at the Lowell Institute, February, 1913. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1913. xv+317 pages, \$1.50 net.

Natural selection by the living organism in evolution has its counterpart in the fitness of the environment for the action of metabolism. For half a century the scientific stress has been wholly on the selection, to so great an extent as usually to overlook and ignore, sometimes to deny, the fitness and its significance in biological evolution. Thus natural theology and theological reasoning were outlawed in many learned circles.

The present volume on an extensive scale of detailed argument discusses the properties of matter and shows the scientific necessity for recognizing the neglected factor. The argument is conclusive and gives distinct footing in science for a contention never given up by the theologian.

But the author's metaphysical application of his thesis is by no means what the theologian might have anticipated or wished. So far is he from supporting the idea of vitalistic evolution as against mechanistic that he actually uses his conclusion as a basis for excluding "vitalism," vigorously. He places the vital, teleological, factor in evolution prior to the origin of the process and concludes that for the scientist the mechanical interpretation of nature is complete and exclusive. And he claims Bergson in support of the principle for which he pleads. At the point of departure from science to metaphysics we may part company with the author and use his valuable data in support of "vitalism."

W. O. CARVER.

Man a Machine: By Julien Offray de la Mettrie. French-English; Including Frederick the Great's "Eulogy" on La Mettrie, and Extracts from La Mettrie's "The Natural History of the Soul." Philosophical and Historical Notes by Gertrude Carman Bussey, M.A., Wellesley College, Chicago. The Open Court Publishing Co., 1912. 216 pages.

This work from the first half of the eighteenth century is presented here in perhaps the best French edition with a good English translation. The extracts from "the Natural History of the Soul" are fittingly combined with the argument for the nature of man as a physical mechanism. This voice, anticipating by a hundred years much that was so popular last century is interesting and the editorial notes show insight and research.

V.—MISCELLANEOUS.

Problems in Modern Education. Addresses and Essays by W. S. Sutton, Department of Education, University of Texas. Boston: Sherman, French & Co., 1913. \$1.35 net.

The twelve addresses and essays contained in this volume discuss vital problems in the field of modern education. From the nature of the case there can be no unifying principle in the several discussions, unless it be that of "concrete idealism." We

note only a few of the most discriminating and suggestive addresses. "Some contributions of the nineteenth century to educational progress," is a topic that the author considers in a vital comprehensive way. The most important contributions are the democratic ideal, the sanity of method based on psychological principles, the professional education of teachers, the universal education under state control, and the development of industrial and professional education. "The organization of the department of education in colleges and universities" is a chapter revealing the wide-spread interest both in Europe and America in the science of educational theory and the art of teaching. In discussing the "Significance of Christian education in the twentieth century," the author shows the fundamental importance of Christian principles in all educational institutions if our schools are to send forth the best equipped men to lead in public thought and worthy citizenship. Some wise and practical things are said on the application of the principle of education to the work of the Sunday-school and the education of the southern negro. The author has one eye open to defects in the Sunday-school and in the development of the negro, but with the other eye he beholds the dawning of a better day. Some interesting items in the educational history of the southern negro are given in a straightforward manner and show the author's acquaintance with the subject and his appreciation of both the present ignorance and commendable progress of "the ebony race."

B. H. DEMENT.

True Wealth, or What Is He Worth? By J. S. Wallace, M.A. The Griffith & Rowland Press, Philadelphia. 50c, postpaid.

Those who have been perplexed when asked to recommend a neat, bright and inspiring little volume to youths whose ideals are being created and habits confirmed, will gladly welcome *True Wealth* from the pen of Prof. Wallace. The thirteen short chapters deal with such topics as Prosperity, Luxury, Risks, Opportunity, Taking Stock, The Price, and The Silent Partner in a most direct and refreshing manner. The volume is replete

with simple logic, sympathetic insight into character and issues, with thrilling illustrations from biography and history.

B. H. DEMENT.

The New Immigration: A Study of the Industrial and Social Life of Southeastern Europeans in America. By Peter Roberts, Ph., author of "Anthracite Coal Industry," "Anthracite Coal Communities," etc. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912. xxi+386 pages. \$1.60.

"This book is an attempt to describe the quality, the industrial efficiency, the social life, and the relation to the native-born of * * * the peoples emigrating to America from the countries of southeastern Europe," who have come now to constitute three-fourths of all our immigrants. This work takes a thoroughly comprehensive view of the whole subject, analyzes it into its several aspects with thoroughness and skill. It takes the emigrant in his home, tells why he leaves, then follows him all the way and into the detailed aspects of his relations in his new home. It is just such a work as every student of this supremely important subject wants. Its thirty-four chapters leave untouched no important topic of the subject.

W. O. CARVER.

Macmillan's Modern Fiction Library. 50 cents per volume, net.

Good books cheap; what a blessing they are! Such is this Modern Fiction Library, that brings to the reader some of the very finest modern works. As samples we have such works as "The Colonel's Story," by Mrs. Roger A. Pryor; "Elizabeth and Her German Garden," a new edition with additions; "A Kentucky Cardinal," and "The Reign of Law," by James Lane Allen; "The Common Lot," by Robert Herrick; and "Kings in Exile," by Charles G. D. Roberts.

These are all well-known works and they are mentioned here only to call attention to the new editions and their inclusion in this popular library.

INDEX

BOOKS REVIEWED

Armstrong, J. C.: Spiritual Law in Natural Fact.....	467
Blakiston, Allan: John Baptist and His Relation to Jesus.....	450
Boardman, George Dana: The Problem of Jesus.....	457
Brown, Louise Fargo: The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Interregnum.....	442
Carroll, H. K.: The Religious Forces of the United States, etc.....	446
Clemen, Carl: Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources..	444
Davis, William Stearnes: The Friar of Wittenberg.....	448
De la Mettrie, Julien Offray: Man a Machine.....	469
Foster, Ora Delmar: The Literary Relations of "The First Epistle of Peter," with Their Bearing on Date and Place of Author- ship	452
Foundation Truths of the Gospel.....	466
Frommel, Otto: Das Religiöse in der modernen Lyrik.....	465
Fullerton, George Stuart: The World We Live In: Or Philosophy and Life in the Light of Modern Thought.....	467
Goodrick, A. T. S.: The Book of Wisdom, with Introduction and Notes	454
Haggard, A. M.: Problems of the Passion Week.....	456
Haller, M.: Die Schriften des Alten Testaments.....	459
Harnack, Adolph: Bible Reading in the Early Church.....	444
Harnack, Adolf: Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein Ursprung- licher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte? Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho.....	453
Hayes, D. A.: The Most Beautiful Book Ever Written: The Gospel According to Luke.....	456
Henderson, Lawrence J.: The Fitness of the Environment; An In- quiry into the Biological Significance of the Properties of Matter	468
Jacquier, E.: Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Eglise Chrétienne.....	452
Johns, C. H. W.: Ancient Babylonia.....	459
Kent, Charles Foster: The Life and Teachings of Jesus According to the Earliest Records.....	455
Kenyon, Frederic G.: Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament	450
Lipscomb, T. H.: The Things Methodists Believe.....	449
Luzzi, Giovanni: The Struggle for Christian Truth in Italy.....	440
MacMillan's Modern Fiction Library.....	471
Marjoribanks, Rev. Thomas: The Sevenfold "I Am".....	456
Marshall, Newton H.: Questions Asked by Young Men.....	438
Mauro, Philip: God's Apostle and High Priest.....	455
Meyer, Eduard: Ursprung und Geschichte der Mormonen mit Ex- kursen über die Anfänge des Islams und des Christentums..	445
Monod, Theodore: The Gift and the Life.....	466
Mullins, Edgar Young: Freedom and Authority in Religion.....	462

Myers, A. J. W.: The Old Testament in the Sunday-School.....	437
Nutter, Bernard: The Story of the Cambridge Baptists and the Struggle for Religious Liberty.....	446
Ottley, Rev. R. L.: The Rule of Life and Love: An Exposition of the Ten Commandments.....	458
Oosterley, W. O.: Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach	454
Pike, E. C.: The Heroes of the Meeting-House.....	449
Railton, G. S.: The Authoritative Life of General Booth, Founder of the Salvation Army.....	447
Riley, Rev. W. B.: The Evolution of the Kingdom.....	456
Roberts, Peter: The New Immigration: A Study of the Industrial and Social Life of Southeastern Europeans in America.....	471
Roberts, Philip I.: The Dry Dock of a Thousand Wrecks.....	438
Seven Oxford Men: Foundations: A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought.....	460
Simpson, James Y.: The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature.....	466
Sneath and Hodges: Moral Training in School and Home.....	435
Souter, Alexander: The Text and Canon of the New Testament.....	451
Sprague, Homer B.: The Book of Job.....	457
Spyri, Johanna: Chel: A Story of the Swiss Mountains.....	439
Strahan, James: The Book of Job.....	457
Strong, Augustus Hopkins: One Hundred Chapel-Talks to Theo- logical Students, Together with Two Autobiographical Addresses	436
Sutton, W. S.: Problems in Modern Education, Addresses and Es- says	469
Thomson, A. H.: The Ground Plan of the English Parish Church..	448
Thomson, A. H.: Historical Growth of the English Parish Church	448
Tralle, H. E.: Sunday-School Experience.....	435
Wallace, J. S.: True Wealth, or What is He Worth?.....	470
Wells, Chas. L.: Manual of Early Ecclesiastical History to 476 A. D.	442
Windisch, Hans: Des Hebräerbrief Erklärt.....	453
Worsley, F. W.: The Apocalypse of Jesus; Being a Step in the Search for the Historical Christ.....	451
Vorbrodt, G.: Zur Theologischen Religionspsychologie.....	439

Notable Books on Missions

Baptists Mobilized for Missions

By ALBERT L. VAIL, D. D., author of "The Morning Hour of American Baptist Missions," etc. Cloth, 12mo. 176 pp. Net, 75 cents

"Doctor Vail has for many years been a close and discriminating student of Baptist history, and has given us in this book the results of his observations and reading respecting the evolution of the organization of the denomination for missionary work. He is unprejudiced in his view and clear in his statement. For those who are now active in our superb organization this book contains some surprises, for it describes conditions that could scarcely be believed possible to-day, and the effect is to make one take new courage when we contemplate the progress that has been made in our co-operative development."—*Service*.

In a Far Country

A Story of Christian Heroism and Achievement. By HARRIETTE BRONSON GUNN. Cloth, illustrated, 12mo. 244 pp. Net, \$1.00

There was a time not so long ago when in the history of our missionary enterprises the name of Miles Bronson was a household word. He was a pioneer in the mission work in Assam. It took him months upon months to get to his field, and almost as long to receive a letter from home. He was exposed to privations and deprivations to which missionary life for the most part is now a stranger. With a loving hand his daughter, Mrs. Gunn, has depicted it all. The book should find its way into courses of missionary study, and no missionary circle can afford to be without it.

Chundra Lela

By Rev. Z. F. GRIFFIN. Cloth, illustrated, 16mo. 84 pp. Net, 50 cents

Chundra Lela was the daughter of a high-caste family in the province of Nepal, India, ruled by a native prince. Doctor Griffin, who for many years was a missionary in India, came in touch with her, and also into possession of details of her family life furnished by herself. Hence the story of her struggles and conversion and ministry is given in her own language to a very large extent.

The Task Worth While

Or, The Divine Philosophy of Missions. By H. C. MABIE, D. D. Cloth, 12mo. 343 pp. Net, \$1.25

"Doctor Mabie's book holds a very high place in the increasing literature on the evangelization of the world. His point of view, his command of the facts, his wide personal observation and rich experience, and above all, his contagious faith in the triumph of the kingdom, combine to make this book one of intelligent inspiration. These lectures made a deep impression upon the student of our theological seminaries, and Doctor Mabie has been so successful in transferring his personality to print that they lose very little in their published form."—*Pres. Geo. E. Horst, Newton Theological Institution*.

The Divine Right of Missions

By HENRY C. MABIE, D. D. Cloth, 16mo. 117 pp. Net, 50 cents

This essay divides itself into two parts. The first concerns itself with showing that the religion of Jesus Christ is superior to all the ethnic faiths, both in itself and in its influence on those accepting it. The second part, based on the first, shows how imperative is the demand that the Christian church shall propagate this religion by the means of modern missions, carrying it everywhere that opportunity affords.

American Baptist Publication Society

Philadelphia

Boston

Chicago

St. Louis

Toronto, Canada

EDITORS

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,
Editor-in-Chief.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN, PH.D., D.D.,
Managing Editor.

W. O. CARVER, TH.D.,
Review Editor.

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.,
Business Manager.

J. R. SANDREY, D.D., LL.D.
GEO. B. EAGER, D.D., LL.D.

B. H. DEMENT, D.D.
C. S. GARDNER, D.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

REV. B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D., Fort Worth, Texas.

REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.

REV. J. H. FARMER, D.D., LL.D., Toronto, Canada.

REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Fort Worth, Texas.

REV. J. P. GREENE, D.D., Liberty, Mo.

REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Chester, Pa.

REV. W. T. WHITLEY, A.M., PH.D., Preston, England.

On general matters address Prof. E. Y. Mullins, Editor-in-Chief; with regard to articles and editorial business, address Prof. W. J. McGlothlin, Managing Editor; with regard to books and reviews, address Prof. W. O. Carver, Review Editor; on business matters, address Prof. A. T. Robertson, Business Manager.

